

# **ASSESSMENT REPORT**

**USAID/Ghana Democracy and Governance Program  
June 20 - July 30, 1999**

Prepared for the Program Office  
USAID/Ghana

by  
Sue Nelson, Team Leader  
Dr. J. Michael Turner, Social Scientist  
Beatrice Duncan, Gender and Development Consultant

## **1. Introduction**

This Assessment was contracted by USAID/Ghana to help it review and evaluate its on-going democracy assistance program (Strategic Objective (SO) Number 4). Designed in 1997, SO-4 underwent a major revision in 1998, and was reformulated from “Enhanced Civic Participation and Accountable Governance” to “Public Policy Decisions Better Reflect Civic Input.” This assessment covers the activities conducted under the revised SO.

The purpose of this Assessment is to assist USAID/Ghana in assessing the performance of its program as well as determining its impact. The assessment covers USAID/Ghana management of SO-4 and its adherence to the SO-4 strategy, as well as activities funded by SO-4. SO-4 grants were given to the International Foundation for Election Systems (IFES) and the National Democratic Institute (NDI). Issues examined included management, implementation, monitoring, reporting, results, impact, sustainability, appropriateness and continued relevance of activities. Recommendations are provided to assist USAID/Ghana in improving its program as well as to fine tune its assistance in order to ensure maximum impact from its dwindling democracy and governance (D/G) resources.

The field work for the Assessment took place in Ghana from June 22 to July 13, 1999. The team consisted of three experts in the field of democracy and governance and Ghanaian politics. The Team Leader was Sue Nelson, former Acting Chief, Office of Democracy and Governance for USAID/Cambodia with 10 years of African field experience. The Senior Social Scientist was Dr. J. Michael Turner, Professor of African History and Latin American History at Hunter College- CUNY, with almost 30 years of professional experience in Africa. The expert on Ghana was Beatrice Duncan, a Ghanaian lawyer and consultant on Ghanaian politics, development and gender.

Although this Assessment was not an in-depth evaluation, the Assessment Team believes it was able to gather enough information for a good review and assessment of the SO-4 program. The Assessment Team interviewed USAID/Ghana, its SO-4 grantees-- NDI and IFES, and their beneficiaries (Ministers of Parliament, District officials, civil society and community based organizations). The Assessment Team also interviewed non-assisted officials and organizations, other donors, coordinating agencies and think tanks. It used a set of standard questions in its interviews to compare SO-4 assisted respondent responses with those of non-assisted respondents (Annex F).

The team visited six districts, four of which are IFES assisted (Tolon and Yendi in the north and Ada and Winneba in the south). The non-IFES districts visited were Tamale (north) and Apam (south). The Yendi district was selected because of its past association with ethnic violence. The team also attended two IFES district-level trainings and one Parliament committee hearing on the Immigration Bill facilitated by NDI. A complete list of persons interviewed is in Annex C. The Team also reviewed the available documentation on decentralization, improved governance and citizen participation, donor assistance, politics and SO-4 (Annex B).

We would like to thank USAID/Ghana for its assistance as well as Dr. Stephen Snook of IFES and Cassandra Woods of NDI, and their staff. In particular we would like to thank our USAID/Ghana sponsors Gregg Wiitala and Sean Hall, and Antoinette Djahlin for her administrative support.

## **Table of Contents**

### **1. Introduction**

### **2. Executive Summary**

### **3. Assessment**

#### **3.1. Strategic Objective Number 4**

#### **3.2. Intermediate Result No. 1: Enhanced effectiveness of Parliament to represent citizen interests.**

##### **3.2.1. Activities planned, funding, grantees and beneficiaries**

##### **3.2.2. Implementation**

##### **3.2.3. Results**

##### **3.2.4. Recommendations**

#### **3.3. Intermediate Result No. 2: Improved effectiveness of (participating) local and national CSOs to influence policy.**

##### **3.3.1. Activities planned, funding levels, grantees and beneficiaries**

##### **3.3.2. Implementation**

##### **3.3.3. Results**

##### **3.3.4. Recommendations**

#### **3.4. Intermediate Result No. 3: Local government decision making processes are more participatory.**

##### **3.4.1. Activities planned, funding levels, grantees and beneficiaries**

##### **3.4.2. Implementation**

##### **3.4.3. Results**

##### **3.4.4. Recommendations**

#### **3.5. Program Management**

##### **3.5.1. USAID SO-4 Team**

##### **3.5.2. Grantees**

##### **3.5.3. Recommendations**

### **4. Conclusions**

#### **Annex A. Scope of Work**

Annex B.	Bibliography
Annex C.	Persons and Agencies Contacted
Annex D.	SO-4 Results Framework & Measuring Tables
Annex E.	Acronyms
Annex F.	Assessment Questions & Results

## **2. Executive Summary**

Ghana is currently enjoying a peaceful transition from authoritarian rule to a multiparty democracy. The 1992 constitution provides for a separation of powers and a system of checks and balances. Opposition participation in the government has increased since the second democratic election held in 1996, although Parliament has yet to initiate legislation or fulfill its checks and balance role. This is Ghana's fourth attempt at democratic rule since independence in 1957, and to date, its longest. However, the democratic consolidation has not yet been completed. There has been no transfer of power in 18 years, and the 2000 elections and its aftermath will be a critical test of Ghana's democratic resolve.

The Government of Ghana (GOG) is continuing its policy of decentralization, started in 1988. This has resulted in both the devolution of power and the transfer of significant resources (e.g.: common fund) to the district assemblies. The availability of local level resources is awakening public interest in local government and is enabling the districts to implement their constitutional responsibilities. Central government still dominates the formulation of legislation and policy, with power concentrated in the executive branch. Widespread poverty and ignorance of civic rights and responsibilities continue to be significant problems, especially in rural areas where 60% of the Ghanaian population lives. Corruption is a major issue obstructing the equitable distribution of resources and power.

International assistance is still needed to support the democratic consolidation and to avoid repeating Ghana's post-independence cycle of brief democratic attempts followed by authoritarian reversions. At the current time, the level of funding for USAID/Ghana's democracy program is being reduced, a result of prioritization in USAID/W. However, the Assessment Team strongly believes that now is not the time to cut democracy assistance to Ghana as the current transition has not yet reached the point where continued pluralism and powersharing has become irreversible.

USAID provides support to Ghana's democratic transition through its Strategic Objective Number 4 - "Public Policy Decisions Better Reflect Civic Input." Assistance is provided to the three Intermediate Results (IRs) detailed below, implemented by two USAID-funded grantees: NDI (IR4.1 and IR4.2) and IFES (IR4.2 and IR4.3). The Assessment Team found the level of funding available for SO-4 inconsistent with the nature and scope of USAID-funded activities which, to date, have been broad, geographically dispersed and expensive. And despite an impressive effort and visible signs of increased citizen participation, the Assessment found little evidence of significant or sustainable SO-level impact directly attributable to USAID/Ghana's SO-4 assistance.

### **IR4.1: Enhanced Effectiveness of Parliament to Represent Citizen Interests**

IR4.1 has had a very slow start, created in part by repeated turnover of international staff and a Washington-based management focus. NDI also allocated responsibility to its slow start to a lack of political will by the leadership of the Ghanaian parliament which preferred material support over democracy activities. Within the past year, significant improvements have been made with the arrival of the current in-country staff, whose efforts to better target IR4.1 activities appear to be placing IR4.1 in a position where it could finally begin an effective implementation of its USAID-funded activities.

IR4.1's initial parliamentary activities were directed towards individual MPs, with an emphasis on workshops and MP outreach. The Assessment found significant "workshop fatigue" in Parliament and limited impact from this approach. The Assessment agrees with NDI's refocus of its activities on legislative drafting and supporting the institutional development of key parliamentary staff. The Assessment concurs that such activities could help build institutional capacity that would outlast individuals and assist Ghana's Parliament in the conduct of its policy making and legislative roles.

The reduction of USAID/Ghana's FY99 funds for D/G activities has resulted in NDI's grant for IR4.1 and IR4.2 being reduced from \$3m to \$1.9m. To save costs, NDI proposed cutting the position of Legislative Advisor. The Assessment findings indicate that the presence of an active, in-country legislative advisor is critical to the success of

this IR, and recommends that cost reductions should be made elsewhere from the more nonessential areas of the grant. To date, IR4.1 has not benefited from a cost-effective allocation of resources, and the current refocus of activities needs to be better reflected in NDI's proposed allocations for the remaining grant funds.

The Assessment recommends a continued narrowing of IR4.1's focus by concentrating on capacity building for parliamentary staff, specifically staff involved in legislative drafting and the 3 committees with which the Assessment recommends SO-4 assist: Assurances; Constitutional, Legal and Parliamentary Affairs; and Public Accounts. IR4.1 activities should also focus using a specific issue which the Assessment recommends SO-4 adopt and use through all of its IR activities, such as government accountability (corruption). IR4.1 also has to factor in 2000 election year issues into its programming.

#### **IR4.2: Improved Effectiveness of Local and National Civil Society Organizations to Influence Policy**

IR4.2 has been working with CSOs at the national and local levels. Although both levels, and in particular, the local level, have been extremely active, the Assessment observed little difference between assisted and non-assisted CSO's in their ability to influence policy. At the national level, the Assessment found numerous examples of non-assisted national CSO's that had successfully influenced national policy, such as the Funeral Directors Association input into the Funeral and Mortuary Act. At the local level, the Assessment found assisted CSOs had influenced issues such as tax collection, with assisted CSOs having negotiated a reduction in their assessments. However, the Assessment also found this true of non-assisted CSOs in non-assisted districts.

IR4.2 assistance has been broad, including consciousness training, management skills, and analytical problem solving. The CSOs at the national level included a youth advocacy coalition, an environmental/animal preservation organization, and a West Africa political refugee association. At the local level, CSOs included small trade associations, such as Hairdressers or Tailor Associations, as well as other local level groups. The Assessment found that the CSOs selected, and the activities undertaken, as of the date of the Assessment, are not consistent with the SO-4 strategy which focuses on advocacy and public policy, and targets CSO's with the mandate and ability to influence policy formulation and dissemination.<sup>1</sup> Local-level IR4.2 activities also include a financial incentive for participants to attend training and for "poverty alleviation" grants. Although, these funds are now being re-targeted for advocacy, the issue of financial incentives raises a number of serious questions, including the appropriateness of CSOs targeted, sustainability issues and the comparative advantage of IFES in organizing what is essentially a broad-based micro-enterprise empowerment activity.<sup>2</sup>

The Assessment recommends a return to the CSO selection criteria developed in the SO-4 strategy, and to target credible CSOs or CBOs with a history and interest in public policy or a mandate of advocacy. At the national level, the CSOs assisted should be relevant to the three Parliamentary committees that IR4.1 would assist to ensure citizen input into their committee deliberations. At the local level, advocacy should be targeted at the unit committee level as well as the district assembly level; and for maximum impact using limited funds, concentrated in no more than 4 adjacent districts in 2 regions. The national and local level programs should be better integrated to maximize resources and impact, and should use the same SO-4 issue as IR4.1 and IR4.3. Financial incentives should be discontinued.

Alternative means to reach a wider target group with participation and public policy messages should also be explored, as the on-going programs providing direct training to selected individuals are too expensive for the current level of USAID resources.

#### **IR4.3. Local Government Decision-Making Processes are More Participatory.**

IR4.3 has been providing capacity building workshops in 20 districts nationwide working with about 20 district authorities per district. Training has been broad running from analytical thinking to management. The Assessment found that assisted district authorities were better able to articulate CSO participation issues, but saw no significant

---

<sup>1</sup> IFES disputes this Assessment finding and believes IR4.2 local level CSOs fit the SO-4 criteria.

difference between SO-4 assistance and District authority (DA) receptiveness or responsiveness to public participation.

The Assessment found significant public participation at the unit committee and elected assembly person level, both of which are not targeted in IR4.3 activities. This decentralized governmental system created for public participation should be incorporated into IR4.3.

The Assessment recommends IR4.3 assistance be concentrated in no more than 4 districts in 2 regions, preferably adjacent to each other in an area where USAID/Ghana has other assistance programs that could provide synergy. The Team suggests USAID/Ghana consider the Central and Northern Regions. Capacity building should be extended down to the unit levels and this assistance should be linked to IR4.1 and IR4.2. The SO-4 issue should be one of the focal points of the assistance. Financial incentives should be discontinued.

### **Program Management**

SO-4 implementation has been negatively affected by management issues at both the Mission and grantee levels. Although, in general, grant requirements are met in terms of adherence to USAID rules and reporting requirements, a universal lack of basic information has hampered effective monitoring and field operations. Communications within the Mission SO-4 team and between the SO-4 team and its grantees are informal and done on an as-needed basis. NDI provides the minimum amount of information required by the grant, and IFES provides extensive documentation, yet it is difficult to determine from either reporting the actual progress made in terms of outputs and results vs. grant targets and SO-4 objectives.

Senior grantee staff in country appear to be highly qualified and experienced, but grant operations remain centralized in their respective US headquarters. This requires extensive, expensive and time consuming consultations between field office and headquarters; and appears to be one of the major factors in NDI's slow implementation of its grant activities. It has also led to significant implementation problems such as the IFES/Ghana office implementing its proposal instead of the grant agreement activities negotiated between USAID/Ghana and IFES/W.

The Assessment recommends the SO-4 team structures already in place be used and expanded to implement SO-4 as a team, both within the Mission and between the Mission and the grantees. Systematize and improve the monitoring and reporting systems so that adequate information is routinely provided and disseminated widely. Improve the official SO-4 filing system so that all documentation and information ends up in the files.

The grantee Field Directors should be provided with the delegation of authority needed to effectively manage field operations and in-country implementation. Grant budget expenditures should be more cost-effective and activity-focused.

### **Conclusion**

The Assessment found genuine commitment and dedication for the implementation of SO-4. It also found widespread evidence of increasing levels of public participation at both the national and local governmental levels and a general sense that "public policy decisions better reflect civic input." However, the Assessment was unable to attribute these results to SO-4 activities. There are too many variables contributing to this result, including other donor programs, the shift of significant resources to district assemblies, and Ghana's tradition of active occupational associations. At the Intermediate Result level, SO-4 activities were too broad and too dispersed, either geographically or through assisting individuals rather than organizations, to have made a significant difference.

The current level, and cost of on-going activities, require more funds than are available for SO-4. To maximize funding and impact, the activities need to be more focused, institution-oriented, less geographically dispersed and more cost-effective. The recommendations for each IR are detailed in this report. However, the Assessment recommends that USAID re-visit its SO-4 strategy to determine if it could make more of an impact using a different set of objectives or implementation mechanisms.

### 3. Assessment

#### 3.1. Strategic Objective Number 4: Public Policy Decisions Better Reflect Civic Input

With the adoption of the new multiparty democratic constitution in 1992, Ghana embarked on a peaceful transition from authoritarian rule to multi-party democracy. Despite its shaky start, when flawed 1992 presidential election resulted in an opposition boycott of the legislative poll, it has made significant progress. The 1996 presidential and legislative elections were more competitive and transparent, and were monitored by a credible civil society observer effort. The election results were accepted, incumbent President Jerry Rawlings (NDC) was re-elected and the number of non-ruling party NDC (National Democratic Party) seats in Parliament rose from 11 to 67.

Although the composition of Parliament changed with the 1996 elections, Parliament as an institution has not yet developed beyond its reactive role of considering legislation submitted by the executive branch. It has yet to draft legislation or fulfill its check and balance role. But Parliament has started soliciting public input into its policy and legislative deliberations.

The GOG has continued the comprehensive decentralization program started in 1988 by giving significant resources (in the form of a common development fund) to the district assemblies. The availability of resources at the local level is changing public apathy and generating new interest in local government. Despite Ghana's goal of becoming a middle income country by the year 2020, rural Ghana still has significant financial and developmental needs. Corruption is a major constraint to an equitable distribution of resources and power.

USAID/Ghana approved a new democracy and governance strategic objective in 1997. This strategy was geared towards consolidating the democratic gains made during the first 5 years of the Fourth Republic of Ghana. The strategy considers Ghana to have the basic elements of a democratic political culture: respect for human rights, political space and consensus on the broad outlines of competition, as well as the institutional framework required for a democracy: a constitution, competitive electoral process and legislative and judicial institutions. The problem addressed by USAID in its strategy was the centralization of power: in the executive branch, at the national center and in the ruling party, and "how best to consolidate multiparty democracy into a representative, responsive governance process that is meeting the needs of Ghanaians." (Pg 2).

The strategy notes that the centralization of power has resulted in a "top-heavy, state-dominated economy and society, huge deficits, high inflation and disincentives to private sector investment." (Pg 2). Although this strategy was designed 2 years ago, the basic problems are still the same. Power remains centralized with a high tendency for decision making to be influenced by party linkages and affiliation at all levels.

The USAID democracy program was designed to address these problems. Although SO-4 was revised in 1998 to "focus more directly on the core problem of executive branch domination and to amplify the effectiveness of civil society and elected institutions at the local and national level" (FY2001 R4), its basic premises remain unchanged. The revised Strategic Objective is: "Public Policy Decisions Better Reflect Citizen Input" which has three Intermediate Results (IRs):

- IR4.1: Enhanced effectiveness of Parliament to represent citizen interest;
- IR4.2: Improved effectiveness of local and national civil society organizations to influence policy; and
- IR4.3: Local government decision-making process are more participatory.

The indicators for SO-4 are detailed in Annex D.

SO-4 has a planned funding level of \$10,158,000 and an end date of 9/30/00. To date, \$2,850,000 has been obligated. It has two implementing partners, IFES and NDI, and activities under SO-4 began in 1997.

IFES had a 1994 grant with USAID (641-0133-A-00-4028) for \$9,543,526 to provide assistance for the 1996 elections. IFES election support cost \$8.5 million. At the end of the elections, IFES requested USAID approval to use the remaining \$1.9 million for its new grassroots proposal called ECSELL (Enhancing Civil Society Effectiveness at the Local Level). This program had an estimated cost of \$2.4 million. This required an additional \$605,146 for a new estimated grant total of \$10,363,146. ECSELL was to go from 6/30/97 to 12/31/99.

IFES subsequently received incremental funding of \$215,000 (4/29/99) and will receive the last tranche of \$605,620 as soon as USAID/Ghana receives its FY99 funds. This will totally fund the grant. USAID is the only donor for the ECSELL program, although IFES is currently in discussion with the EU and UNDP for additional funding.

ECSELL activities focus on IR4.2 and IR4.3. It planned to provide 9 workshops in 20 districts (1 per region) to about 10 CSOs and 20 District authorities per district. The workshops were reduced by IFES to 5 for programmatic reasons, and focused on consciousness training, technical skill transfer and collaborative analytical problem solving.

The grant for NDI (641-G-00-97-00233) began on October 1, 1997 for "Strengthening Parliament and Increasing Citizen Participation in Democratic Governance." The activity was expected to be completed by December 31, 2000 at a cost of \$3,000,000. USAID is the only donor and is incrementally funding the grant. NDI has received two tranches of funding for a total of \$1.4m. USAID will not be able to fully fund this grant due to USAID/W budget cuts. USAID will provide a final tranche of funding (\$500,000) as soon as it receives its FY99 funds. This will reduce the grant total to \$1.9 million.

NDI activities focus on IR4.1 and IR4.2. NDI recently submitted a revised workplan and budget reflecting the lower grant total for USAID approval. It proposes reducing field activities and eliminating the position of Legislative Advisor as of the end of September 1999. USAID is reviewing the proposed changes, but in the meantime, NDI has started to implement its revised plan which focuses on legislative drafting support services, civic advocacy and civil society inreach.

## **3.2. Intermediate Result 4.1: Enhanced Effectiveness of Parliament to Represent Citizen Interests.**

### **3.2.1. Activities planned, funding levels, grantees and beneficiaries**

The NDI grant represents the sole USAID-financed activity providing assistance and training to Ghana's Parliament, as well as advocacy training for national civil society organizations intent on influencing the national legislature (IR4.2). NDI estimates 70% of its \$1.4m grant funds to date (\$980,000) have been spent on IR4.1. NDI estimates future IR4.1 expenditures will be approximately 30% (or about \$150,000) of the remaining grant funds, bringing the total estimated cost for IR4.1 to \$1.13m.

The original grant workplan planned activities with "Members of Parliament and legislative staff to build capacity within Parliament and to establish mechanisms through which citizen input could be incorporated into the legislative process" (NDI grant proposal, Pg 2.) NDI planned to provide training and technical assistance to Parliament through structured activities, including seminars, round tables and formal consultations, as well as responding informally to needs as they arose by serving as a resource center, providing documentation about how other parliaments functioned and to advise on constituent relations and provide strategic advice. NDI planned on working with the Speaker and leaders of committees and factions in Parliament to set priorities for its institutional development.

However, as NDI planned and administered its first public forum in November 1998, a meeting held in Koforidua capital of the Eastern Region, the experience proved to be less than participatory for those representing civil society organizations and opposition political parties. The agenda of the meeting was controlled by the Majority Speaker and the Party in power; and opposition parties experienced difficulties when they attempted to respond to questions which were addressed to them. Also of concern to NDI was that in a program whose goal was to increase the ability of civil society to interact with and question parliamentarians, the format imposed by the Majority Party left little

time for questions from the constituents of Koforidua. The constituents, who represented potential beneficiaries of this activity, were frustrated as they were not able to fully question their elected officials. Based upon this rather negative public forum experience, NDI decided to modify its public forum approach in an effort to make the institution of parliament truly more representative of citizen interests.

The new approach decided upon by NDI has been labeled “*in reach*” as the emphasis on the public forum, the actual convening of the so-called town-hall meetings now is done by the constituents. In having the CSOs convene, and administer the public forum, with organization done in conjunction with NDI, the project goal of promoting the conditions for more of a citizen-parliamentary dialogue, or at least creating more of an enabling environment for that dialogue to occur seem to have become more realistic.

### **3.2.2. Implementation**

Implementation of IR4.1 activities has been extremely slow. Some of this can be attributed to management problems. As discussed in the Management Section, NDI's grant is managed out of NDI/Washington and has required lengthy consultations between Washington and Ghana. IR4.1 has also suffered from frequent staff changes. Within the 20 months of grant operations there have been 3 Field Office Directors and two Legislative Advisors.

The IR4.1 parliamentary program has focused on two major areas: advocacy and institutional strengthening. The August 1998 arrival of NDI's third Resident Country Director, and subsequent arrival of its second Legislative Advisor, in retrospect, resulted in a significant change in orientation for the NDI parliamentary program. Their arrival had been preceded by a March 1998 NDI seminar on “Civic Advocacy: NGOs in Public Policy.” The seminar attracted over 70 Ghanaian NGOs who by their presence represented diverse interests and advocacy interests. Attendance also of several members of Parliament at the meeting served to demonstrate to the civic society organizations as well as to attending MPs some of the forms and thinking which advocacy strategies might assume. One strategy agreed upon at the March 1998 meeting was the importance of CSOs with advocacy interests in particular sectors and issues to come together and form coalitions around their specific issues.

NDI devoted an increased level of effort to assisting the formation of these CSO issue coalitions, believing that the coalition approach would be more effective in influencing policy and elected officials. NDI/Ghana went on to work with nine issue related coalitions including groups interested in Children's Rights, Youth in Development (CONYD), Ecumenical Association for Sustainable Agriculture & Rural Development (ECASARD), Environmental NGOs, Human Rights NGOs, The Ghana Union Traders Association, the Christian Mothers, the Association for the Advancement of Women in Africa and the African American Association of Ghana. While the range of issues within the universe of coalitions formed and given NDI-training can be said to be diverse and exhaustive it does raise issues concerning real impact on the formation of policy and influence on parliamentarians, as the issues chosen, while certainly of importance, also show themselves to be complex and not of easy or rapid solution and resolution.

Advocacy and CSO-parliamentary relations became central to NDI's parliamentary activities. This in-reach approach-- with the lead being taken by civic society organizations-- proved different in several ways from the more usual parliamentary public forum. If other international organizations such as Friedrich Ebert preferred to organize parliamentary public fora more in concert with the parliamentarians' traditional agendas for interaction with constituents, NDI consciously chose the CSOs as the focal point of the advocacy program. NDI's town hall meetings held in Kumasi (February 1999), Wa (April 1999) done in collaboration with IFES, and Sunyani (June 1999) also proved to be less costly than the more traditional public fora by following a *town hall-style* format. These truly public meetings organized by civil society organizations to meet with their elected representatives and ask questions pertinent to the problems and issues facing these local communities were characterized by lively debate, particularly the Wa meeting in which the veteran Deputy Majority Speaker from all indications ably defended himself and his party through a quite lengthy barrage of constituents' questions and revindications. As the tone of these town hall sessions was set far more by the CSOs than by the attending parliamentarians, they also served as good training experiences for the fledgling issue-oriented CSOs in the process of learning how to lobby selective parliamentary committees.

Another component of the NDI-program for institutional strengthening of the Parliament has sought to emphasize training and technical assistance primarily for members of the institution who are permanent staff. This emphasis on providing opportunities for training experiences more to staff than Members of Parliament seems to the Assessment to be consistent with other components of the parliamentary program. Given the known vicissitudes of politics, an investment of a limited training budget in permanent staff professional advancement as opposed to overseas short term training or lengthy study tours for parliamentarians strikes the Assessment as appropriate.

Given this overall program rationale, the training activity surrounding legislative drafting and the initial decision to sponsor production of a legislative research and analysis manual in theory were reasonable strategies. However, the problems came in execution, particularly with the creation and development process for the legislative manual. While the major points of delay as explained by NDI-staff were the need to obtain through a collaborative process the concurrence and approval of the Chief Parliamentary Clerk, and ultimately the approval and concurrence of the Parliament. Considering that NDI sponsored a team in May 1998 to prepare the draft legislative manual, that process has been most labor intensive for the project. Requests for modifications and changes coming from the Parliament had to be considered and entertained by NDI, which was made more difficult seemingly by what was described in NDI-documentation as "Parliament's reluctance and/or inability to come to a consensus on a final draft" ((6/21/99 Memo "Parliamentary Program Overview: Talking Points"). As of the departure of the Assessment Team from country, the purported manual was still at the printer's and had yet to be distributed.

The program's attention to legislative drafting while selective in its first instance, and tied to international training, appears to have been successful. Three Parliamentary Clerks and one parliamentary draftsman from the Office of the Attorney General were sponsored by NDI to attend an intensive course at the International Legislative Drafting Institute at the Public Law Center, a joint program organized by the Loyola and Tulane Law Schools. The course was held from June 14-25, 1999. Unfortunately given the timing of the return to Ghana of the participants, the Assessment was unable to meet with any of the four participants.

The Assessment was able to meet the Ghanaian professor and international expert on legislative drafting Professor V.R.A.C. Crabbe who will administer the planned in-country legislative drafting program for permanent parliamentary staffers. Professor Crabbe who has recently returned home to work in the Office of the Attorney General has taught at law schools throughout the British Commonwealth, most recently at the University of the West Indies Law School. The current plan for the in-country legislative drafting course is that NDI/Washington may make this a regional course, and with separate funding, possibly include parliamentary staff from Liberia. The in-country course currently is planned for August 1999.

NDI also sponsored a 1998 assessment of the research capability of the Parliament, a mission which included the law librarian of the University of the West Indies and an African Affairs specialist at the Congressional Research Service, Library of Congress. The mission and final report on the research facility (seemingly not widely distributed in-country) were described in internal NDI-documentation as again being targeted to strengthen the institution of Parliament. It is to be hoped that those within the institution who did gain access to this report on the research capability of Parliament will be able to employ the findings in benefit of the institution.

As recounted to the Assessment, Parliament soon will be entering its periodic but democratic time of transition as the country will be preparing for elections, currently planned for 2000. The impact of the electoral process on parliament as an institution, as well as the anticipated changes in MP seats will impact all parliamentary technical assistance efforts. On the national-level, as correctly identified by the NDI Country Director, parliamentarians during the next eighteen months in Ghana increasingly will be concerned with the lead up to, execution of and parliamentary personnel consequences of the anticipated 2000 presidential and general elections. This will represent a challenge to all organizations desiring to work and collaborate with that institution, most certainly for CSOs attempting advocacy and lobbying activities with parliamentary commissions.

Given the upcoming elections, concentrating on training activities such as legislative drafting primarily with parliamentary staffers such as committee clerks, or specific parliamentary committees such as the Committee on Government assurances again seems appropriate to the Assessment. This Committee, like the Parliamentary Committee on Constitutional, Legal and Parliamentary Affairs both have indicated a clear willingness and interest to

receive NDI-training. In the case of the Committee on Government Assurances the cause of transparency and accountability can be tracked as its parliamentary charge is to ensure that all government promises made by ministers and other official spokespersons on the floor of Parliament eventually are honored by the Government. “In theory assurances are supposed to be given in instances where answers to questions are not readily available...where Ministers do not want to commit themselves to specific requests by MPs, they resort to giving assurances” (The Committee on Government assurances in Ghana's Parliament: A call for assistance., 24th May, 1999). Given what undoubtedly will be a period of transition, for the Assessment it does appear to make better programmatic sense for D/G grantees planning on working with the legislature to focus activities in these areas.

During the Assessment, several issues for IR4.1 implementation were identified, including:

- **Parliamentarian fatigue with training programs:** The multiplicity of donor programs promoting training for parliamentarians either in country, within the region, continent, or training with parliaments within the host donor country, has resulted in conference and training fatigue among many Ghanaian parliamentarians. NDI has been sensitive to this problem and has redirected much of its training focus to its town hall meeting approach which emphasizes relations between CSOs and representative parliamentarians.
- **Relationship with the Parliamentary Speaker:** The change in focus for the citizen-parliamentary exchange being championed by NDI has placed the CSOs in the position of organizing the town hall meetings which has had the effect of allowing CSOs to set the agenda of the sessions. In the in-reach format, parliamentarians find themselves in perhaps the unusual situation of having more to respond to the citizen's priorities, problems, and perceived needs. This more participatory approach clearly is less of interest to the Speaker's agenda than the earlier NDI activities and the more conventional approach to citizen-parliamentary meetings being sponsored by such organizations as The Friedrich Ebert Foundation Stiftung.
- **Better coordination of parliamentary support programs :** Given the multiple donor assistance programs for the Parliament of Ghana, an active parliamentary donor working group is a necessity to avoid needless overlap and duplication of program efforts and scarce budgetary resources. USAID/Ghana might consider hosting a working group meeting to ensure greater participation by agencies providing technical support and/or funding to the Parliament.
- **Cost-effectiveness.** IR4.1 implementation has not been cost-effective. In addition to the primary problem of NDI's allocation of the bulk its resources towards management as discussed in the Management Section, the initial activities with Parliament were expensive. *Many of these activities required outside experts, who required international travel and per diem even though they worked pro-bono.* The Assessment did not have access to a breakdown of NDI expenditures within IR4.1, but using the estimated IR4.1 expenditures to date of about \$1m divided by the 20 months of grant operations, gives IR4.1 a cost of just under \$50,000/month.
- **Payment of honorarium by other donors.** The fact that other donors funding parliamentary assistance programs offered honoraria and `sitting fees' to parliamentarians participating in their training and assistance programs, (donor examples cited to the Assessment were Canada and the European Union) set an unfortunate and non-sustainable precedent. As under the terms of the NDI Grant Agreement, only travel and per diem expenses can be awarded to parliamentarians attending NDI training programs, the stated policy and spirit of the CSO-parliamentary dialogue was inconsistent with payment of honoraria to parliamentarians.
- **NDI's proposal to eliminate the position of Legislative Advisor.** NDI has had to develop a revised workplan and budget to reflect the lower total of the grant (as discussed in the Management Section). This workplan proposes cutting the position of Legislative Advisor for cost reasons as of the end of September 1999. The Assessment found this position critical to the implementation of this IR. Within Parliament, the Assessment repeatedly was provided with positive commentary concerning the activities of the current Legislative Advisor, his positive attitude towards the institution, and enthusiasm.

### 3.2.3. Results

The legislative assistance program is able to demonstrate a successful CSO-parliamentary town meeting format, and four parliamentary clerks successfully completing an overseas legislative drafting course. The Assessment expects the proposed legislative drafting course will take place in August 1999, and that the long-delayed Legislative Research and Analysis Manual will be printed and available by the end of July 1999. However, USAID/Ghana has yet to receive a copy of the 1998 Research Facility Assessment report on Parliament's research facility. While internal NDI documents (6/21/99 Memo "Parliamentary Program Overview; Talking Points") indicate that a copy of the report was shared with Parliament and Chief Librarian Charles Brown, the report was not among program documents offered to the Assessment. The Assessment believes such a basic document could assist and orient the parliamentary donor group in its deliberations over lacunae in parliamentary documentation.

The SO-4 Results Framework has two indicators to measure the results of IR4.1. They are: "improvement in the quality of legislative debates and the number of open committee meetings held;" and "the percentage of debates and open committee meetings which include interaction with civil society." As reported in the Mission's FY 2000 R4, NDI's efforts to increase the inclination of Parliament to permit more civic participation can be measured in part by analyzing the number of legislative initiatives that were the direct result of civic input. NDI measurements indicated only 33% of legislative initiatives were the result of civic input in 1997. The civic input percentage rose to 50% in 1998, against an NDI civic input target of 55% of all legislative initiatives. Important also was the passage of a highway and road safety bill, as it was the first successful private member motion, in a parliament with a history of almost all legislative initiatives emanating from the executive branch. The Assessment concurs with USAID/Ghana that the 1998 passage of this private member bill is a significant accomplishment for the advocacy and public policy activities being supported under IR4.1., and that NDI's advocacy training with CSOs was a contributing factor to the Children's Rights Bill and the Value Added Tax Bill.

Despite an increased institutional understanding of parliamentary decision making, and increasing CSO influence on legislation for many issues, training in advocacy and lobbying may prove to be only partial solutions. Given the often complex nature of social problems, advocacy training alone cannot provide solutions to intractable social problems. The frustration registered by the youth advocacy coalition to the Assessment in attempting to change attitudes both in Parliament and in the ministries supposedly concerned with the problems facing Ghana's youth, indicate the need for additional strategies and methods when addressing social issues. Specifically in the case of the coalition of Youth advocates, what was seen to be lacking in their advocacy work was hard data on the problems facing the country's youth. As the Assessment met with top-ranking scholars at the Center for Democracy and Development (currently receiving some limited support from USAID/Ghana) and The Institute of Economic Affairs (IEA) who related the interest of their 'think-tanks' to do more participatory and applied research projects at the local and grassroots level, possible avenues for collaboration and synergy flowing from research institutes to civil society and advocacy organizations would seem possible and logical. It is to be hoped that those donor agencies who are sensitive to the need for and the importance of first-rate applied research to address social problems will be able to create more of an enabling environment for this synergy to occur.

Based upon field visits, interviews and analysis of available literature, the Assessment believes that the modification in program orientation undertaken by NDI in 1998-97--specifically to focus on the interaction between civil society organizations and parliamentarians by providing training to CSOs in lobbying activities, advocacy of a *town hall* civil society-parliamentary dialogue strategy, evidenced by the April 27, 1999 meeting in Wa District, can be seen to have been prudent in terms of potential medium-term program sustainability. Our concern however, is that this level of focus on parliamentary-civil society relations may be having only limited impact on the overall process of parliamentary institution building and ultimately, the effective strengthening of Ghanaian civil society.

**Do MPs Represent Citizen Interests? (Assessment Question No. 6b)**

**Assisted vs Non-Assisted Respondents**

		Assisted			NonAssisted			Total
	M	F	T	M	F	T		
<b>Yes</b>	12	4	16	11	5	16		32
<b>No</b>	10	4	14	9	1	10		24

**By Location**

		Accra				South				North		
	M	F	T		M	F	T		M	F	T	
<b>Yes</b>	6	5	11		10	1	11		7	3	10	
<b>No</b>	6	3	9		6	2	8		7	0	7	

The challenge for democratization programs focusing on parliamentary-CSO relations was underscored in a statement made by a majority party MP to an Assessment team member in which he discovered only at a town hall meeting that the majority of CSO-leaders receiving training through the IFES District Assembly-CSO program came from his home village. Before the seminar the MP was completely unaware of the programs or even the existence of these civil society organizations. While the town hall meeting had served to focus his attention upon CSOs within his constituency, the fact that a veteran parliamentarian (over six years serving in Parliament) was unaware of these groups--even with CSO leaders from his home village-- illustrates the marginality characteristic of many of the country's civil society organizations. Also important in raising the consciousness of the MP was that this was a town hall in which the approach and methodology of NDI was complemented by the local level methodology of IFES and Program ECSELL. As the Wa town-hall meeting was considered successful, it points to the desirability of more collaborative efforts between the two SO-4 grantee organizations when seen to be appropriate.

As Ghana prepares for general elections in 2000, major issues facing the country should be debated by parliament and closely monitored by civil society. The Assessment questions whether issues such as parity among all political parties for media access and campaign funding, or the ever present fact of corruption and the lack of accountability in the political and electoral process would be more important issues for IR4.1 to focus upon in its CSO-parliamentary activities? Given the political instability and turmoil which has so roiled the West Africa sub-region, be it Liberia, Sierra Leone, Guinea-Bissau, Togo, or Nigeria (whose hard won democratic rebirth continues to confront the challenge of ethnic differences), it is of utmost importance that Ghana's elections in 2000 be in fact as well as in perception as transparent as possible. As a third election in the lengthy process of national reconciliation, for the country and for the sub-region, much is indeed riding on next year's electoral process.

As the Assessment sees the 2000 elections as critically important for consolidating Ghana's democratization process, it believes NDI's CSO-parliamentary advocacy program might have a greater impact if it were to focus more on political and electoral issues. Issues such as transparency and accountability of politicians and within national society are important for the country in the short and medium term. As there are limited D/G funds for SO-4, it would make sense to tackle major governance issues that impact upon society, particularly if the program is limited in working with selected organizations and institutions.

The Assessment believes the question of whether there is more impact from targeting selected individuals and organizations as opposed to working with whole institutions and organizations, must be linked to the total level of funding being provided for all D/G activities within the Mission's SO-4 program. General reduced funding for D/G activities necessarily will restrict the Mission from working effectively with whole institutions and organizations, making donor coordination and institutional program coordination all the more important, as no donor will have the fiscal and staff capacity to work with a whole institution.

These considerations also take into account the fact that Parliament and the country will be focusing upon the upcoming 2000 presidential and national electoral process. With the general distraction of Parliament because of these upcoming elections, a serious question is posed as to what level of parliament should a training program be

focused, if at all? Could a public advocacy focus on accountability, transparency and corruption as linked to the 2000 campaign serve to distract the Parliament less, as constituents would more carefully follow and judge campaign statements and promises?

Questions exist if donor funding were to cease, if the national parliament itself would provide necessary resources to continue these activities? The Assessment would assume that preference would be given to activities which directly benefit permanent parliamentary staff, whose careers are directly linked to the institution, as well as development of a research and documentation capacity and facility for the Parliament.

#### **3.2.4. Recommendations**

- The Assessment believes the parliamentary advocacy program should continue to narrow its focus, particularly as it concerns the kind, type and number of CSO coalitions who should benefit from the training experiences being offered. The Assessment agrees upon the program concentration on capacity building for parliament staff, specifically staff involved in legislative drafting and the 3 committees with which the team recommend SO-4 assist-Assurances, Constitutional, Legal and Parliamentary Affairs, and Public Accounts.
- It is our recommendation that the parliamentary institutional training activity expand the proposed legislative drafting course to include more parliamentary staff and perhaps some carefully selected MPs, once the first legislative drafting course has been judged successful by beneficiaries and funders, and in a timely manner perhaps to become a candidate for additional funding under a potential World Bank legal assistance program.
- The Assessment believes the parliamentary advocacy program could play an important role in bringing increased public attention to potential campaign issues during these months leading up to the 2000 elections. If the program were to specifically target democracy and governance issues such as the need for equitable and transparent campaign finance rules to govern all major political parties; or measures which the general public might employ to help ensure full and equitable political party access to national media resources, these activities could have a major influence on the general conduct of the next electoral process.

### **3.3 IR4.2 Improved Effectiveness of (participating) Local and National CSOs to Influence Policy.**

#### **3.3.1. Activities planned, funding levels, grantees and beneficiaries**

The national-level activities for IR4.2 are implemented by NDI through the civil society component of its parliamentary program. In its grant workplan, NDI planned on providing two types of technical assistance to CSOs. The initial phase would be to build the institutional capacity of selected "fledgling" organizations with an interest in public policy. The second phase would be to help these NGOs apply their advocacy skills on issues of democratization and good governance within Parliament. The output was expected to be NGOs serving as a conduit for information between parliament and the public as well as to influence public policy making. NDI estimates it spent 30% of its \$1.4m grant (\$420,000) to date on IR4.2, but anticipates raising this level to 70% for the remaining grant funding (\$350,000).

The local-level activities for IR4.2 are implemented through the IFES Program ECSELL which was started with the remaining balance of its 1994 election-specific grant. This cooperative agreement had been in effect since 1994, and the remaining balance of \$1.9m at the end of those elections can be seen as a major contributing factor to the decision to initiate Program ECSELL.

ECSELL's objectives are to strengthen civil society at the grassroots; to increase civic advocacy; and improve the responsiveness of District Assemblies to community needs. These were decided after a 1997 IFES assessment of the state of Ghanaian civil society and local government. A March 1998 IFES-baseline survey concluded that a series of workshops and training should target CSOs and District Assembly officials to achieve the program's three

major objectives. It was decided to work in 20 districts nationwide out of 100. The program seeks to prove the efficacy of advocacy training and the strengthening of civil society organizations at the grassroots and local level. CSO interaction with government is also a major component, as training has been provided for District Assembly level elected and appointed officials, and staff, as well as the civil society advocates. ECSELL, in its local level training for both civil society and government is attempting to prove that democratization, and a mutually useful and respectful dialogue, can exist at the grassroots between civil society and government.

***IFES does not track its USAID/Ghana grant expenditures by election or ECSELL activities. However, it estimates that 30% of the \$2,132,911 figure IFES uses for the amount of grant funding available since July 1997, was used for election-related activities. This leaves an estimated \$1,493,038 for ECSELL activities. 58% of this was used for IR4.2 implementation (\$865,963). This percentage will rise to approximately 60% for the remaining grant funds (\$363,000) for an IR.2 local-level total of \$1,408,000. This will bring the total amount spent on IR4.2 by both grantees to \$1,998,962.***

### **3.3.2. Implementation**

NDI initiated advocacy training activities with CSOs working on such issues as Children and Youth Rights; Human Rights; Women and Development; Sustainable Agriculture and Rural Development; and Emigration and Naturalization of non-Ghanaians. National level seminars on civic advocacy; parliamentary lobbying; policy analysis; utilization of the media for advocacy by CSOs; and fundraising techniques for advocacy by CSOs were conducted consecutively in 1998 and 1999. The CSO parliamentary advocacy program was refocused in 1999 to provide training for a diverse group of issue-oriented CSOs.

NDI field staff decided to initiate a new component of the advocacy program administration of a small grants program. NDI estimates that the total budget for this program of 2-3 grants will be approximately \$80,000. NDI states the program will allow the selected local organization to undertake local level and grassroots versions of their “inreach initiatives” which these local CSOs would not be able to do without funds which the subgrant program will provide. NDI believes the subgrants will allow local organizations to provide advocacy training workshops for other NGOs in their community, and in their promoting a mini-town hall format, they will also be learning to organize and better administer D/G events. Currently none of the 3 subgrant proposals identified by NDI field staff have been discussed directly with USAID/Ghana. Only one of the proposals has been sent to NDI headquarters staff to be vetted.

IFES originally planned to administer 9 ECSELL training workshops, however this was reduced to 5 workshops for programmatic reasons. ECSELL is currently administering its fifth and final training workshop on “Enhancing Civic-Government Collaboration and Participant Observations on The Complete ECSELL Program”. The Assessment visited two training sessions in Tolon and Winneba (7/7/99). The major problem encountered was the perception by the majority of CSO participants that the final training session would provide them with specific guidelines to secure grants from the new District Assembly poverty alleviation fund. Participants were under the impression the poverty fund was going to be augmented with matching grants from the ECSELL program. In reality, IFES decided not to fund income-generation activities, but only to provide funding for CSO advocacy activities.

The Assessment was troubled by the extent to which participants’ expectations of possible ECSELL complementary funding for potential income generation projects had superseded the more important knowledge of advocacy and management techniques which were at the heart of the ECSELL program. CEDEP facilitators and IFES-staff spoke frankly with the Assessment concerning the expectations and anticipation of the participants concerning this funding promise. Their concern was that disillusion would result when it was announced at the end of the training that ECSELL funding was not going to be made available for economic development activities. Unfortunately, the mixed messages coming out of the ECSELL training experience often have resulted in questionable pedagogy, and non-sustainable development thinking being passed on to program participants.

Informing training participants of this major program change was a concern both for IFES field staff and for the CEDEP workshop facilitators. The facilitators had been tasked on the last day of the training of informing CSO

participants that income generation matching funds would not be provided by Program ECSELL. The risk was that participants (both CSOs and DA officials alike) might suffer disillusionment because of the mixed messages which had been given during the training cycle. Fortunately, IFES-field staff advised CEDEP facilitators that IFES would serve as an advocate for participating CSOs in soliciting income generation funding from other donors. However, full reaction of CSOs to news of the funding decision by ECSELL will only be fully assessed upon termination of the current workshop cycle.

Several key issues identified for IR4.2 during the Assessment, include:

- Effectiveness of CSO advocacy work. As was discussed above, serious consideration should be given to changing the focus of CSO-parliamentary advocacy activities to better reflect the political problems currently challenging the country. While youth advocacy is an important social problem, it is a complex issue which cannot be solved solely by lobbying and advocacy. Increased government transparency and better accountability throughout Ghanaian society are important and immediate issues that will influence the 2000 elections. What role can parliament and local level government play to see that there is a more level playing field for all citizens, greater access and accountability on all levels of the society? Do constituents know their elected officials views and positions on these issues? Would a more informed public debate on and analysis of the Political Party Bill have a positive impact on the upcoming elections? These are issues and open questions which the Assessment thinks IR4.2 grantees should consider in their future program planning.
- Use of financial incentives has been amply discussed, as has the issue of the absence of an institutional comparative advantage for IFES to administer an income generation program. The Assessment was informed by several CSOs and some DA officials that their participation in ECSELL was because of the financial incentives. Once in the program they recognized the usefulness of the training, but said they would not have participated, or continue participating without the financial incentive. What then becomes the degree of local ownership of the program, when financial incentives must be offered to induce attendance at workshops, or provide complementary funding for development activities? Financial incentives also raise issues of medium and longer term project sustainability.
- The Assessment is also concerned that a local level advocacy program working with government seemingly has only cursory relations with the Ministry of Local Government. While the Ministry may not be promoting sincere local level and grassroots democratization, some regular contact should be maintained between ECSELL and the Ministry, as it remains the central government agency tasked with administering official decentralization activities. While it is important to question the degree of political will on the part of the government to promote grassroots democratization efforts, CSOs should also be trained to hold the Ministry accountable for its actions.
- Lack of coordination between national and local level implementation of IR4.2. The impact of IR4.2 activities would be strengthened if advocacy work being done on the national level and through the parliament committees enjoyed some resonance with the advocacy work being promoted on the district and grassroots level. The jointly sponsored town-hall meeting in Wa represents an example of such collaboration. More regularly scheduled meetings between the two SO.4 grantees to discuss possible areas of complementary activities and programs would serve to increase coordination. If activities were to be narrowed to geographical areas in which other Mission Strategic Objective programs were located, this geographic focus and concentration also could strengthen participating programs and have the potential to increase Mission program impact.
- The Assessment is of the view that this program is not consistent with the SO-4 strategy which wanted a focus "on advocacy and public policy CSOs to increase their ability to influence policy formulation and dissemination." CSOs to be used were "CSOs with a mandate to shape public policy, either through information, education and communication, research, coalition building, interaction with public sector officials." (strategy page vi/vii).

- Neither the national or local level assistance provided under IR4.2 appear to be **providing SO-4 level results commensurate with the amount of funding being spent**. Using the estimates provided by NDI and IFES, the Assessment estimates national level assistance cost \$21,000 per month and local level assistance cost **\$36,082** per month.

**Participation in local decision making (Assessment Question No. 9a)**

	Assisted			NonAssisted			Total
	M	F	T	M	F	T	
<b>Yes</b>	15	3	18	16	3	19	37
<b>No</b>	4	4	8	5	5	10	18

**Participation in national decision-making (Assessment Question No. 9b)**

	Assisted			NonAssisted			Total
	M	F	T	M	F	T	
<b>Yes</b>	13	4	17	9	2	11	28
<b>No</b>	8	4	12	12	4	16	28

### 3.3.3. Results

IR4.2 has two indicators from the SO-4 Strategy. These are "Target CSOs have improved capacity to promote their advocacy agendas" and "Targeted CSOs have improved internal management skills." The first indicator "improved capacity to promote advocacy agendas" is to be measured in the SO-4 "Performance Monitoring Plan," differently at the national and local levels. The Assessment did not locate *an SO-4 level* measurement for the second indicator "targeted CSOs have improved internal management skills" and assumes USAID/Ghana is not tracking this indicator. The Performance Monitoring Plan also included an objective measurement entitled "number of meetings between participant national CSOs and policy makers." The Assessment is not certain that the number of meetings is an accurate indication of "improved capacity."

On the national level, "improvement in performance" is to be measured based on an advocacy scale where "improvement is measured by a combined score on key criteria of internal and external relations scored on an advocacy index." This was supposed to include "benchmarks such as interaction with policy makers, coalition building skills, policy formulation, initiating actions to influence policy and follow up and monitoring of their input." The results for 1998, including the baseline figures, according to the SO-4 Performance Monitoring Plan, was "to be determined."

A Matrix was recently developed by NDI, in response to a Mission request made in 1998. Preparation of that Matrix suffered a very lengthy delay as the preparation of the document was done at NDI/Washington, and not in the field. The Matrix developed is designed to measure NGO/CSO impact on public policies. The data for the Matrix has been derived essentially from interviews with CSO coalition directors whose CSOs received NDI-training. Individual CSO coalition institutional members have also recently received questionnaires (which at the time of writing the Assessment) have not been returned to, or tabulated by NDI. While preliminary indications from the Matrix would indicate increased advocacy activities on the part of the participating CSOs, and increased meetings between CSOs and policy makers, more data coming from individual CSO coalition members will be statistically more significant, and a source for a final and definitive evaluation of the program.

For the objective measurement "Number of meetings between participating CSOs and policy makers," the Performance Monitoring Plan shows the 1998 baseline and result as 14, but the target at 16. However, NDI's Matrix does indicate that the number of open parliamentary committee meetings is increasing. In 1998 there were 14 open meetings. A target of 22 open meetings has been set as a goal for the 1999 NDI program; and a target goal of 30 open meetings has been set for 2000.

The local level measurement of "Percentage of participating local CSOs who report initiating contact with District

Assembly officials to advocate on behalf of their cause," is measured by the percentage of reports. The ECSELL grant has implemented an extensive monitoring program involving a total of 107 indicators in all 226 groups. Specific Questionnaires were developed for 1) local civil society officials, (64 questions covering organizational structure and development, economics, and democratic advocacy); 2) District Assembly officials (19 questions on district administration, District-CSO relations, and district training needs); 3) Chiefs (8 questions on chief's opinion of the District Assembly); 4) Village Durbars (16 questions on concerns of durbar constituents, with one of the questions gender specific on particular problems and issues facing women).

These provide extremely interesting research information but are too subjective for USAID purposes. For example, the scale indicates "knowledgeable", "very knowledgeable." or "somewhat knowledgeable." There is no control group to compare results with because of "expense and ethics," as related to the Assessment by the IFES Field Director. The Assessment has questions concerning the validity of the responses, as the questionnaires are completed by the participants themselves at the end of the workshops and their answers are open to fabrication. When asked about this, the IFES Field Director acknowledged that respondents will answer subjective questions "strategically", and that its Participant Observers could develop their own agendas. However, IFES/Ghana uses field visits and its POs to corroborate answers. The Field Director believes 95% are honest answers, and so far has not thrown out any "wrong" answers -- primarily because he believes there have not been any.

When questioned about the amount of information collected, the IFES *Project Manager* admitted that its data collection focus perhaps could be considered "overkill;" however he believes the ECSELL experience and data collected all provide importance evidence for social science analysis of local participatory governance in contemporary Africa. For the Assessment, the question remains should limited (and declining) D/G funds be employed for what has become a social science research experience, even one which demonstrates such an impressive level of intellectual effort in its research design and methodology?

In the non-assisted "control areas" visited by the Assessment, groups who were busily engaged in diverse activities linked to advocacy, lobbying, and D/G activities were interviewed. The fact that several *regional* non-assisted organizations were completely unaware of Program ECSELL activities is representative of our concern about the impact of Program ECSELL and we believe should also represent a concern for the program. In the case of northern Ghana, there were control group activities in districts where Program ECSELL training had been taking place. Specifically in the case of the Tamale regional CSOs: (The Muslim) Community Development and Youth Advisory Center and Maatu-N-Tudu (Northern Women's Association) their unawareness of the IFES-district assembly advocacy training programs was of concern to the Assessment. Both northern regional CSOs administer large outreach programs. The Assessment observation in southern Ghana observed a similar phenomenon as CSOs in Apam, the control district, did not know about ECSELL programs occurring in adjacent Winneba.

The Assessment believes that the issue concerning SO-4 activities working primarily with individuals, or separate component activities instead of entire institutions constitutes a valid development question. This becomes extremely pertinent if increasingly limited D/G budgets would require limiting the number of organizations receiving support and training, thereby making selection of an institution, CBO or CSO one that should have maximum potential and impact for influencing policy making. For both current SO-4 grantees, this could involve potentially difficult choices and trade offs. If IR4/2 activities at the local-level were to be limited to two geographical areas, preferably areas with other significant USAID/Ghana Strategic Objective programs, selection of potential IR4.2 beneficiaries might follow different criteria, with larger or more regional groups perhaps taking precedence over the more traditional ECSELL CSO.

These more modest target groups are discussed within the context of the SO-4 USAID/Ghana Strategy Document which states: "... the Mission was concerned that given the large universe of such organizations, there needed to be more specificity in terms of the subset of CSOs to be strengthened. The Mission agreed that focusing on advocacy and public policy CSOs to increase their ability to influence policy formulation and dissemination, is appropriate at this time, and could, potentially, have the greatest impact in the future. CSOs with a mandate to shape public policy, either through information, education and communication, research, coalition building, interaction with public sector officials and the like are potential customers of the project..." (Pg. vi/vii).

While the Assessment found that CSO beneficiaries of ECSELL activities often did respond that their contacts with District level officials had increased, or that some policy modifications or changes had occurred for which their organization could take some responsibility, in the control areas non-assisted CSOs also made similar claims. One could conclude that given the general increase in civic association activities and advocacy as seen nationally by the Assessment in its discussions with a wide universe of civil society spokespersons ranging from a former Ghanaian Ambassador to the United Nations to a women's agricultural producer's cooperative outside of Yendi, advocacy and lobbying activities in general are increasing in Ghana. In fact, the survey conducted by the Assessment comparing assisted and non-assisted (control) responses to questions about government responsiveness and citizen participation in public policy making, did not find a significant difference between the two groups, (except for the question on MP representation *detailed in Section 3.2.3.*). This confirms the Assessment's perception that it is difficult at the local level, for one geographically dispersed program to have had a significant or quantifiably measurable impact on improving public participation and policy making.

**Satisfied with outcome of meeting with DA or MP? (Assessment Question No. 3)**

	M	Assisted		NonAssisted			Total
		F	T	M	F	T	
<b>Yes</b>	19	5	24	19	5	24	48
<b>No</b>	3	2	5	3	1	4	9

During the field visits, the Assessment was struck by the community radio station in Ada. This local language public radio station reached an audience of 2-3 million and had already resulted in public participation in local decision making and law enforcement. For example, market women used the radio to get district authorities to enforce public transport tariffs. The District Authorities in Apam also mentioned a district assembly radio station used to disseminate local language public service messages before a lack of spare parts forced it off the air. The Assessment recommends SO-4 explore some of these alternative mechanisms for increasing public participation and government accountability. With limited funds, mass media could reach a larger target audience than the individual level of training currently being undertaken.

Given the significant international donor interest in supporting D/G activities in Ghana on a national, as well as local level, the Assessment questions whether those CSOs presently benefiting from SO-4 activities would continue these proto-lobbying activities without external resources? With a declining D/G budget, we question whether support might not be better targeted at larger issue-oriented membership organizations such as the Ghana Bar Association and Ghana Journalists Association, groups who use their member dues to finance institutional programs. Also, their relationship with similar international organizations, w.g., American Bar Association, National Bar Association (historically Black organization) have resulted in technical assistance and in-kind donations to Ghanaian institutions, e.g., modern court stenographic equipment presented as a gift to the Ghana Supreme Court.

The D/G Assessment debriefing concluded that it would be desirable to ascertain whether a survey of all Ghanaian civil society organizations currently working on democratization and governance activities had been done. The recommended assessment would take into account current NGO compilations being conducted by consortia such as GAPVOD, but would target those CSOs--including relevant CBOs--with a specific focus on D/G. Once the recommended survey of Ghanaian CSOs and CBOs working in D/G activities is concluded, USAID/Ghana would need to determine whether these CSOs and CBOs are grant-worthy for direct USAID grants, or if it might wish to consider continuing its work with an intermediary organization such as IFES, NDI, the Africa America Institute (AAI), or another USAID-registered international organization which could provide basic management training and mentoring for the local CSOs and CBOs, as well as collaborating in program development and strategic planning with the most promising local CSOs for the promotion of specific D/G activities under SO-4.

### 3.3.4. Recommendations

- The Assessment is concerned that current IR4.2 local level program activities are, in part because of dispersion in both a geographic, and programmatic sense, having only limited potential impact upon the program's beneficiaries. Within the category of beneficiary the Assessment includes representative civil society

organizations and District Assembly staff, appointed, and elected officials. The Assessment recommends a far more limited and focused geographic and programmatic focus if these activities are to continue receiving increasingly limited USAID funds.

- The Assessment recommends throughout the present report that a specific issue which it recommends SO-4 adopt and use through all of its IR activities, specifically corruption and government accountability. Using this rationale, we recommend that the CSO-parliamentary advocacy program concentrate its tested CSO-parliamentary town hall format of citizen-parliament interaction on accountability and transparency issues linked to the 2000 general elections.
- The Assessment believes given the limited amount of D/G funds available for USAID/Ghana's SO-4 activities, linking this advocacy program with other Mission Strategic Objective programs might prove beneficial. It is possible that private sector activities, CSOs working on population, health, and nutrition issues (e.g., Tamale Muslim Community Development and Youth Advisory Center) would provide both synergy and different perspectives to ECSELL's current group of CSOs. Our recommendation would be for ECSELL to work in two geographical areas where there are other Mission programs, perhaps focusing or liaising more with a smaller group of select regional CSOs with good institutional track records. By so doing, the potential for more effective policy impact on the district and/or regional level should increase.
- The Assessment strongly believes true advocacy training should remain separate from economic and developmental activities such as income generation, whose outcomes and goals are valid, but different from the goals of an advocacy program. Considering the institutional history and profile of IFES, we strongly recommend that advocacy continue to be the major focus and goal of any future program. The Assessment holds the opinion that mixing advocacy with economic development activities runs the risk of compromising that program, and most likely will not result in sustainable programs promoting either advocacy or economic development. The Assessment recommends that the poverty alleviation program of ECSELL be spun off to an international NGO which specializes in micro-enterprise and micro-credit.

The Assessment is concerned about the potential impact of the advocacy program to influence policy on both the local and national level. Therefore it recommends two quite different options for the consideration of the SO-4 supported grantees. Each recommendation concerns the selection of the most appropriate CSO for maximum potential program impact.

- The Assessment recommends that the IR4.2 national-level programs target CSOs who would continue proto-lobbying activities, even if external donor funding were to cease. Groups such as the Ghana Bar Association, or the Ghana Journalists Association might represent credible national-level interlocutors for such a program. It also believes it is important for maximum impact, that the national organizations to be supported in a future program be credible civil society organizations with policy interests complementary to the parliamentary committee interests that IR.4.1 would be targeting in its program activities. The Assessment recommends that the SO-4 Team discuss with the CSO-parliamentary advocacy program administrators whether a smaller and more focused effort with the aim of influencing three or four parliamentary committees on very targeted issues might not have a greater impact. These committees would correspond to the activities undertaken in IR4.1.
- Thinking locally at the same time, the Assessment believes encouragement of local level CSOs and CBOs also is important for the promotion of democracy and governance in Ghana. At the local level, potential institutional candidates should demonstrate a history in promoting advocacy, or other areas of democratization and governance. This advocacy experience can be evaluated using the following indicators:
  - CSO has specific program activities which focus on d/g issues and priorities;
  - CSO has some institutional track record and verifiable program accomplishments and success in attaining its d/g objectives i.e., workshops conducted; popular education pamphlets produced; responsible for lobbying or advocacy activities on a local level;
  - CSO internal administration indicates transparency and accountability;
  - CSO stated objectives and goals demonstrate understanding of, and commitment to increased democratization/governance on either a local, regional, or national level;

- CSO demonstrates a successful institutional administrative history liaising with other donors
- The Assessment recommends that future activities characterized as IR4.2.local-level should focus on community based organizations and advocacy groups at the unit committee and district level. Following the criteria delineated above, the institutional track record will be an important consideration, to distinguish serious candidates from those groups merely interested in receiving external funding. If such a program were to be considered, it would be important that little or minimal financial incentive be offered to CBOs participating in the program, to ensure that participants are stakeholders. If the program is successful it should be able to strengthen ownership of all activities through the direct involvement of community based organizations.

### **3.4. Intermediate Results Number 3: Local Government Decision Making Processes are more Participatory.**

#### **3.4.1. Activities planned, funding levels, grantees and beneficiaries**

The IFES Program ECSELL component which focuses on local government at the District Assembly-level constitutes the sole USAID-funded activity within IR4.3. Planning for this activity was initiated in 1997, the first workshop was presented in 1998, conjointly with the local level IR4.2 activities. IFES estimates it has spent **48% of the \$1,493,038 spent to date on ECSELL (\$627,075) on IR4.3 activities.**

The methodological framework of ECSELL has concentrated at the district level, with its aim of providing training for elected officials, civil service workers and appointed officials, in two districts in every region of Ghana. These are the same 20 districts in which IR4.2 activities are being implemented. This provides Program ECSELL with an overall total of 20 district assemblies and about 345 district authority officials whom ECSELL identified and selected to participate in a series of training workshops on the following topics: strategic program planning, proposal writing, finance, budget analysis, and accounting procedures. An integral component of the Program ECSELL methodology is the conviction that local democracy and participatory government depend upon an informed and well trained local government which will then be able to better address the needs and priorities of the local citizenry. For an advocacy program to be effective, that program should provide a set of diverse skills to increase the technical capacity of government. Democratization at the local level is seen as an important partnership between government and the citizen, in which both partners benefit, while developing an increased trust in the capacity of the other to problem solve and take responsibility for their actions. This methodology and theory informed the workshop cycle promoted by Program ECSELL. To increase government responsiveness to citizens at the local level, ECSELL set about building a collaborative relationship between district officials and local level IR4.2 assisted CSOs. IR4.3 training and workshops were designed specifically to facilitate joint problem identification.

Program ECSELL's methodology presented the civic-government collaboration as a process with different stages and components. As trust between the partners increased during the course of the workshops, each group would begin to see the other more as a prospective partner and less a member of an opposing and hostile team with competing and/or conflicting objectives and goals. Once mutual confidence had been established between the ECSELL partners, and agreement had been reached concerning the local priorities and needs of the CSOs, ECSELL envisaged the formation of joint civic-government boards. These joint boards, operating hopefully in as transparent a manner as possible would have access to some limited financing through access to the recently created District Assembly poverty alleviation funds. Successful ECSELL training would increase the technical and analytical capacity of the partners to serve on these joint civic-government boards to select and administer the local grants program for the CSOs. This grant process has been fully described and analyzed by the Assessment in IR4.2.

Following the rationale of the ECSELL strategy of investigating and promoting democratization and better governance on the local level, ECSELL was purposefully located in selected districts in all regions of the country "after consultation with donors, NGOs, the Ministry of Local Government and others supporting democratization projects." (IFES proposal Program Description, pg .2). This decision of IFES to position the ECSELL program on a national basis has resulted in a very wide geographic dispersion of its local government training activities, as discussed earlier. Program ECSELL carefully chose its GOG beneficiaries to represent elected and appointed

district-level officials, along with GOG civil servants who had been assigned to district-level positions. This variety in government participation mirrored the diverse nature of the government presence within the District Assembly.

### 3.4.2. Implementation

Start-up activities were initiated in 1998, and Program ECSELL presented its first workshop in March 1998. As the initial workshop was designed to introduce ECSELL formally and directly to all of its prospective beneficiaries, the program decided that the district officials would meet in separate workshops from the CSOs. In the original workplan, ECSELL was to administer a total of 9 workshops in its training cycle. After some consideration and discussion between IFES and the Mission, the nine workshops were seen to be excessive given the somewhat limited capacity of both CSOs and District Assemblies to absorb that large a number of training workshops. Therefore for programmatic reasons the number of training workshops was reduced to five.

Budget and programmatic issues developed during the first year of implementation, caused by internal communications problems within IFES. As discussed in the management section, IFES/W had negotiated the grant agreement with USAID/Ghana, but had failed to provide a copy of the grant agreement to IFES/Ghana. As a result, IFES/Ghana started implementation of its proposal rather than the agreed-upon grant agreement.

The second workshop was held in June 1998 on "Collaborative Analytic Problem Solving" which worked to have district officials and CSO cooperate as teams in a joint workshop format. Separate workshops were held for district officials on "Strategic Planning and Resource Management" (9/98) and "Proposal Writing and Institutionalized Public Participation". The ECSELL local government training activity is currently providing beneficiaries with their fifth (and final) training workshop. This workshop held during the Assessment was to create a joint civic-district board that would manage the matching funds that IR4.2 had agreed to give participating CSOs for poverty alleviation projects (more fully discussed in the IR4.2 section).

Following discussions with USAID and other interested donors, IFES decided to move the IR4.2 activity away from a micro-credit type of activity to an advocacy program. IFES also decided it would not contribute matching grant funds into the District Assembly common funds in support of income-generating activities for the CSOs, or CBOs. As this funding had been widely discussed and promoted at earlier training workshops, the change in course-- which the Assessment believes was the proper decision for IFES to have made, given the organization's institutional history and strengths-- obviously represents a major concern not only for the CSOs, but also for the local government officials whose poverty alleviation funds would also have been recipients and beneficiaries of the IFES funding.

The Assessment noted in Ghana that a general perception existed from parliamentarians through rural producer organizations that successful democratization was to be achieved through poverty alleviation. The strength of this belief that without income generation activities one could not discuss real democratization undoubtedly influenced IFES to consider a developmental strategy. However the comparative institutional advantage of IFES is not in the field of income generation. The Assessment would encourage the SO-4 grantees to promote a wider understanding of the positive and developmental nature of good advocacy programs for government as well as civil society. If democratization is to become sustainable, it must be seen and understood as an ongoing and changing process, one with many interlocking components. Advocacy in the best sense should be understood as being beneficial also for government, and not just a tool of pressure to be utilized by Non-Governmental Organizations contesting government. This developmental nature of good advocacy also needs to be imparted to the CSOs within Project ECSELL. Advocacy should not be seen as being second best or less important than economic developmental activities, but an allied and accompanying skill to advance the interests of the local community.

The Assessment identified the following issues for IR4.3 implementation:

- Financial Incentives. ECSELL pays District officials 10,000 cedis a day for attending IR4.3 training. This is more than the 3,000 cedis elected district assembly persons are paid to attend official meetings. (*IFES notes that these meetings rarely last an entire day.*) In addition, the question must be asked if the incentive of receiving additional monies from ECSELL for future common fund-financed activities served as a major

motivation for attendance of local government officials at ECSELL workshops or participation in the ECSELL program. While the Assessment was given examples of district officials utilizing their ECSELL training subsequently to obtain other donor funds for particular training activities, the possibility of accessing ECSELL funds for development projects within their own districts must be seen as potential 'carrot' for regular attendance at training workshops. The Assessment noted the frequent referrals to the financial incentives during its field visits by ECSELL participants, both at the DA and CSO levels, thus the Assessment poses the question if the program would have had the same level of participation without the incentives. Told by CEDEP staff in Yendi that the senior district official had attended no more than two ECSELL meetings during the entire workshop cycle, it can be seen that for some, even financial remuneration was not sufficient to capture interest in the program.

- Discussions with a wide range of Ghanaian civil society spokespersons, parliamentarians, government representatives and donors indicate that the unit structure provides interesting opportunities for strengthening democracy at the grassroots. The Assessment recommends that IFES and Project ECSELL explore the possibility of implementing an advocacy training experience at the level of the unit committee. Given the very low voter turnout at the last unit committee elections, and the accessibility of unit politics for the ordinary Ghanaian citizen it would be useful for ECSELL to work with CBOs and CSOs interacting on the level of the unit, as well as providing training for selected DA officials in more effective ways to manage and administer programs from the District Assembly level to the unit committee. As ECSELL turns to other funding sources and USAID D/G funds decline, this geographically more modest program would provide the possibility of positively influencing democratization at the grassroots level.

### **3.4.3. Results**

ECSELL has implemented 5 workshops in 20 districts to approximately 345 district level authorities. The Assessment was told by district authorities in several districts that tax collection had increased as a result of the ECSELL program, as IR4.2 CSOs had negotiated a lower tax assessment in return for collecting taxes from their members. The Assessment also found non-assisted CSOs had negotiated lower tax assessments in non-assisted districts. The Assessment noted that IR4.3 district participants were better able to articulate CSO participation issues but did not note a significant difference in assisted district receptiveness or responsiveness to civic input.

There are two sets of measurements for IR4.3. The first is IFES ECSELL measurements. The second are the IR4.3 indicators required for USAID funding of the grant.

The Assessment finds that while the IFES ECSELL documentation and statistical analyses can be considered both extensive and exhaustive, the Assessment is not certain that they provide real insight into what has been transmitted and absorbed during the course of ECSELL implementation. The statistical measurements which attempt to track and delineate institutional attitudinal change are intellectually interesting, undoubtedly of social science value, but perhaps not the best measure of development learning, or democracy and governance indicators. The somewhat critical perspective of the Assessment in large part stemming from the subjective nature of the measurements, was confirmed by the Assessment survey and statistics, as relating to CSOs self-perceived impact upon local decision makers. It is interesting that the Assessment survey does show a difference between assisted and non-assisted groups and their self-perceptions concerning their group's influence on national policy. (Please refer to Chart #--; Annex F) As indicated in the Assessment survey, assisted-CBOs did respond with greater frequency than the non-assisted groups that they had been able to influence policy decision making on the national level. Assessment observations made during its field visit to assisted and non-assisted areas, organizations and individuals were not as clear cut as the Assessment survey results. The field visits and survey findings did not indicate a significant difference between assisted and non-assisted district authorities in their dealings with CSOs and citizens.

For SO-4 monitoring, the results expected under IR4.3 were: to be measured by two sets of measurements: "number of mechanisms of participation that are being used." and "the number of new mechanisms of participation."; and "increased frequency of use of existing and new mechanisms. The Assessment understands that the first indicator was added at USAID/Ghana's request and concurs with this addition. Given the representational nature of Ghana's local government system, the Assessment found the most active levels of public participation at the elected unit and

national assembly person level. The "new mechanism" indicator does not capture this type of participation or assistance by local government authorities. The Assessment also notes that the SO-4 Performance Monitoring Plan dated June 22, 1999 has no results listed and targets "to be determined." As a result, it is impossible for the Assessment to make a determination of results or determine a trend in activity impact through the official SO-4 reporting mechanisms.

The Assessment was unable to distinguish an impact at the district authority level attributable to IR4.3 assistance. As discussed earlier in the section, tax collection had improved in assisted districts. However, the Assessment found it had improved in non-assisted districts as well. District officials in assisted districts appeared receptive and responsive to CSOs and citizen participation. However, non-assisted district officials appeared to be just as responsive. In Apam, the Assessment noted a group of tribal elders gathered to discuss land policy with the district officials, as well as numbers of citizens waiting in line to meet with district officers. In Winneba, an assisted district, the Assessment noted a public demonstration on bad road construction that was immediately addressed by the entire district assembly. In fact, so many officials were dealing with the road situation, that the Assessment saw only one or two district officials at the joint CSO-district assembly workshop being held during its visit.

#### Has work of DA's improved? (Assessment Question No. 4a)

	M	Assisted		NonAssisted			Total
		F	T	M	F	T	
Yes	18	5	23	18	5	23	46
No	2	2	4	3	1	4	8

#### Why/How has DA work improved (Assessment Question No. 5a)

	M	Assisted		NonAssisted			Total
		F	T	M	F	T	
More citizen satisfaction					2	2	2
MP Assistance					1	1	1
More citizen involvement	1		1	7		7	8
More CSO interaction	3		3				3
Common fund	1	1	2	5	1	6	8
Better services/job	6		6	1		1	7
More pol competition	1		1	1		1	2
More receptive/aware	6	1	7	2	1	3	10
Listens does nothing		1	1	1		1	2
Better relations	1		1				1
Needs more transparency				1		1	1
Too busy				1		1	1

According to IFES, the results for this IR, cost \$35/per participant per workshop. However this does not take into account the overhead and administrative costs of the activity and grant management. Using the total estimated cost of IR4.3 through workshop 5 at \$627,075, with an estimated participation of 345 district officials, gives a participant cost of \$363 per workshop. Or if divided by the 24 months of grant operation gives a monthly cost of \$26.128. While CSO representatives were expected to serve as trainers within their own institutions and local areas, acting themselves as local trainers, and while undoubtedly this did occur in the ECSELL program, the costs of the whole training activity *are not sustainable without continued outside funding*. The Assessment questioned DA officials as to what might be the future of these district level advocacy efforts when funding for ECSELL activities terminated,. Usually DA officials gave very general responses of how the responsibility would be passed on to the districts to continue such activities; however, no details were provided as to how this might occur, or where funding would be obtained for such activities.

#### 3.4.4. Recommendations

- The Assessment is recommending that IR4.3 consider the possibility of moving its training focus more to the grassroots level and work with the new unit committee structures. Many of these new unit committees are fledgling institutions without cumbersome and entrenched administrative structures already in place. It would be important for the unit committees to receive IR4.3 training along with local CSOs and CBOs. It is recommended that this training promote and emphasize fiscal management, strategic planning, accounting and the importance of transparency and accountability. Good governance techniques to promote administrative accountability particularly in areas of tax and revenue collection also should be stressed. If this IR4.3 program on the unit level were to prove successful, it could become an important model and pilot project for subsequent replication and provide important new and interesting data concerning democratization at the most basic and grassroots level.
- The Assessment also encourages IR4.3 to strongly consider the effect and potential program impact of providing training within a smaller geographic concentration of districts. These training activities would be preferably in the same areas as other ongoing Mission Strategic Objective activities. This geographical proximity would permit greater synergy between Mission activities, while also promoting possibilities for greater program impact within a target region or area.
- The Assessment also encourages IR4.3 to focus its level of effort on institutional capacity building rather than on selected individual skills enhancement and individual representatives of CSOs and CBOs. While IR4.3 program participants were tasked with returning to their individual organizations and communities to train group colleagues, the impression given was a program that focused more on individuals than groups. A new training methodology that focused on groups could also work at the grassroots and unit committee level.
- The Assessment recommends that IR4.3 also consider providing assistance to District Assemblies for clarification of their administrative relationship to the unit committees. The Assessment was concerned that public knowledge of and information concerning the unit committees was sketchy and incomplete. Little discussion seems to be occurring on defining and regulating the formal relations between the District Assembly and the new unit committee structures. This lack of administrative clarity in unit-district assembly relations could provide IR4.3 with an interesting opportunity to provide needed technical assistance and training on public administration to a still dynamic and evolving example of local level public administration. The Assessment believes ECSELL has the capacity and experience to offer training which could result in a more effective administration and interaction between the District Assembly and the unit committee. To the extent that this technical training would also emphasize and promote greater transparency and accountability at the unit and at the district level, it could have a potentially important impact within Ghana, and serve as a model for replication by other new and evolving local governments structures.

### **3.5. Program Management**

#### **3.5.1. SO-4 implementation by the USAID SO-4 team**

SO-4 is located in the USAID/Ghana Program Office. The Team Leader is the Program Office Director. The grants are managed by USAID/Ghana's Democracy and Governance Advisor who has also been designated as the Contractor's Technical Officer (CTO). The D/G Advisor reports directly to the SO-4 Team Leader. Both officers are relatively new, having arrived after the SO-4 strategy was designed and the grants negotiated and issued.

The SO-4 "team" is also relatively new, having been established during a Mission-wide retreat in October 1998. During that retreat it was decided to reorganize the Mission into "teams" based on the strategic objectives. The "SO-4 Team" was created which included the Team Leader, CTO, the Program Office Monitoring and Evaluation Specialist, and representatives from the various Mission offices involved with the D/G program such as the Controller and Contract Offices.

The SO-4 program is small and has only two grants. Its funding averages \$1.4m a year and, as previously discussed, its level of funding is declining because of USAID/W programming choices. Being a small program, it has been

handled by the two principle officers (Team Leader and CTO). The "team" mechanism has not been used, although a wider group of interested persons attend the regular six month SO reviews. The Assessment found considerable interest among the extended SO-4 team members in participating as a "team" and being more involved with SO-4.

SO-4 is monitored by the Mission Director on a bi-weekly basis through a regularly scheduled meeting with the Team Leader (sometimes accompanied by the CTO), and during the in-depth 6 month reviews. The Mission Director also holds a quarterly meeting with all USAID/Ghana grantees, including NDI and IFES.

The CTO has been responsible for the day-to-day management and monitoring of the project, with the active assistance of the Team Leader. The CTO received on the job training from the Team Leader, and attended a regional program implementation course, as this was his first experience with USAID. The CTO reviews IR activity implementation from personal contact with the grantees, from their quarterly reports and correspondence, and from intermittent field visits. Grantees are contacted on an as-needed basis, as are other members of the SO-4 team. Management has tended to be informal, and despite an organized CTO, few institutional systems have been developed that could be used by an alternate.

Official correspondence, grantee reports and other essential information goes directly to the Team Leader or CTO and, in general, is not circulated to the wider SO-4 team. Official SO-4 files are almost non-existent and, as a result, the CTO has started keeping documents in a working file.

Grant agreements and amendments are negotiated by the Contracts Office based on grantee proposals and the programmatic agreements reached between the CTO and grantee. Grant agreements tend to use the grantee proposal as the program description which include activities and their costs which did not make it through the negotiation phase. As a result, the grants do not contain an accurate description of current activities, outputs or anticipated results. The IFES grant is also 6 years old and designed for election support. Its many amendments to add the ESCCELL program has made it a very confusing contractual document, and very difficult for USAID to track election vs ESCCELL expenditures. The Assessment also noted that the CTO does not routinely receive a copy of SO-4 grant agreements or amendments and the Program Office did not have a complete set of grant documents for either agreement.

A minimum amount of reporting is required by the grant agreements. Although, in general, the Grantees are meeting these minimal requirements, and at present on a timely basis, these requirements do not generate enough information for the CTO to be able to adequately monitor grant implementation or SO-4 expenditures. IFES attaches copies of technical documents and reports to its quarterly report, but NDI has not, preferring to summarize activities in its quarterly report. These technical reports appear to be required in NDI's Grant Agreement, Section 1.6.1. (c) which requires: "for each training activity, appropriate documentation, such as forms, announcements, agendas, working documents, action plan monitoring and evaluation and other relevant documents." These documents should be provided to USAID/Ghana with NDI's quarterly reports.

Reporting in general lacked quantifiable results or outputs that USAID/Ghana should be tracking. Some of these problems are linked to indicator issues as discussed in the IR sections. However, quantitative information could be provided in each grantee's quarterly report through a simple table that details outputs vs. grant targets. This information could be used by USAID/Ghana to track SO-4 progress as well as provide data for the Mission's use in justifying its request for continued D/G funding levels with Washington.

Grantees are also providing financial status reports as required on a quarterly basis. However, these reports are not useful for CTO purposes as the form only provides for the total amount of money spent during the quarter. In its quarterly report, IFES includes a breakdown by line item for the amount obligated, amount spent in the quarter, amount spent to date and remaining grant funds. This format should be required in all grants, but with detail provided within the line items so that the CTO has enough information to monitor financial expenditures vs. grant activity progress as well as to ensure grantee compliance with the terms of the Agreement.

SO-4 currently does not maintain tracking tables other than the R-4 D/G Performance Monitoring Plan. The Team understands that USAID/Ghana will be implementing a Mission-wide tracking system within the next year. In the

interim, the Assessment recommends the CTO develop simple tracking tables to facilitate monitoring of grant targets vs actual results, for both programmatic and financial information.

The SO-4 program was authorized from 9/30/97 to 9/30/00 with a total estimated level of funding of \$10,158,000. This includes \$2,833,000 as host-country contributions. As of the last 6 month review, 63% of the project time had elapsed but only 39% of the USAID funds had been obligated. In addition, several discrepancies need to be addressed by SO-4 management within the near future. These include: the NDI grant agreement which has a completion date after the end date of the SO; the 12/31/99 end date for the IFES grant which has the funds to go through 5/00 for its subgrant program; and documenting the addition of \$1m into SO-4 of election funding which will be governed by a separate special objective. SO-4 also needs to determine the status of the host-country contribution and update the SO-4 documents. The Assessment Team had a difficult time determining what indicators and measurements are currently in use by the SO-4 performance monitoring plan.

Despite the fact that only 39% of its funding had been obligated, the activities undertaken to date have been expensive in relation to the results accomplished. For example, IFES told the Assessment that the average cost per participant for an ECSELL workshop was estimated at about \$35. However, this does not factor in the administrative and overhead costs for the IFES grant. Based on IFES' financial statement dated 4/30/99 which showed \$1.7m of ECSELL expenditures through workshop 4, and estimating that 795 persons received training in each workshops (345 DA and 450 CSOs), the average participant cost per workshop was \$534. NDI reported spending \$1.1m through 4/30/99. Approximately 87% of this was spent on international salaries, travel, communications and indirect costs. The NDI Field Director told the Assessment that NDI had reduced the cost for its in-country activities in 1999 by using international experts already in Ghana on a pro-bono basis, but NDI's proposed budget for 8/99 to 2/00 still includes travel costs for 4 international trainers.

Multiple donors are active in the D/G sector, and USAID coordinates with them and the GOG through a bi-monthly UNDP/NIRP donors meeting. This appears to be a useful forum for broad-based information sharing, and for grantees, such as IFES, to present their activity program. Although SO-4 is more pro-active on election support coordination than it is on routine DG support, it is actively working on important issues such as eliminating donor funding for government "consultants" working on D/G projects.

The SO-4 CTO started a quarterly grantee meeting in early 1999. This appears to have been done around the issue of completing the reporting tables for the last R-4 Review. The Assessment recommends that this meeting be systematized and done on a monthly basis. The Assessment found little coordination between grantees, and that a more regular sharing of information on activities, problems encountered and other issues, such as the upcoming elections, would be mutually beneficial, increasing synergy between IR4.2 local and national level efforts, and increasing impact. Included in these grantee meetings should be the extended SO-4 team including the Embassy and USIS team members.

Individually, grantees are meeting with other donors. Notably IFES with UNDP and the EU; and NDI reaching out to the World Bank, UNDP and EU. These efforts should be expanded and perhaps a relevant donor representative could be invited to participate in the monthly SO-4 team meetings as issues arise, such as the Michigan State D/G survey.

### **3.5.2. SO-4 implementation by Grantees**

The IFES Ghana office is headed by an American Project Manager with a Ph.D. in Political Science. It has 4 principle Ghanaian staff who deal with logistics, grant administration, program implementation and finance. It has hired a three-quarter time "Participant Observer" for each of its 20 districts. The POs work out of their homes. Workshops are implemented by 4 local organizations contracted and trained by IFES. Each contractor is responsible for a particular geographic region and all teach the same subjects, the same way, during the workshops. The Assessment felt the IFES local staffing levels to be adequate for the workshop type of activity, but has concerns that the planned addition of only one assistant accountant will provide them with enough capacity to manage and monitor what will be a complex nationwide subgrantee operation.

The Assessment was impressed with the quality of the IFES staff, especially the Participant Observers met during its field visits. The Assessment Team concurs with IFES that IR4.2 and IR4.3 activities requires the presence of an ECSELL staff person to provide follow up and facilitation in each of the assisted districts. According to IFES, most POs are retired headmasters and received individual orientation when hired and a later regional inservice training. There is little coordination between the POs in the different districts, and the Assessment agreed with the POs who told it that increased contact between districts would have been beneficial.

The Accra IFES staff supervise the 20 POs and monitors activities through quarterly visits to each assisted district. The POs submit a bi-monthly report on activities undertaken using a standard reporting format. The 4 training organizations provide IFES with a report on each workshop cycle undertaken. IFES has put a lot of effort into its results measurements. It started with a participant baseline, conducted a midterm survey at the end of the first year, and is planning a final survey for August. IFES uses the same questionnaire for each survey, which it administers to participants at the end of the workshop. Although the questions are subjective and open to fabricated answers, IFES told the Assessment Team that it had verified answers from 184 out of the 226 CSO groups through the use of focus groups and participant observers reports. To date, they say they have found no wrong answers.

The local IFES office is responsible for the day to day management of the ECSELL operations and the funds spent within country. IFES/W is responsible for overall grant management and international expenditures. According to IFES/W, Washington-based expenses, including the salary of the Project Manager, account for about 25% of the grant totals. The Assessment found the Project Manager did not have a copy of the IFES grant agreement with USAID and is not provided with a breakdown of grant expenditures within line items. This has resulted in misunderstandings by the Field Office on the total amount of funds actually available for ECSELL (for example, the Field Office believes \$2.2 m was available for the ECSELL activities at the end of the election activities instead of the \$1.9m figure used by USAID)<sup>3</sup>, and in significant implementation problems, such as the local office initially implementing the IFES proposal for ECSELL rather than the negotiated grant agreement activities.<sup>4</sup>

IFES appears to have a very favorable reputation among donors in Ghana, and presented its ECSELL program during the last UNDP/NIRP donor coordination meeting. This appears to be generating other donor interest in funding the ECSELL program, with the Project Manager in active discussions with both UNDP and the EU. There is some discussion of programmatic issues (related to financial incentives) and a push by UNDP for IFES to coordinate with the GOG at the national level. The issue of GOG coordination was discussed with IFES after the Deputy Minister for Local Governance told the Assessment Team that he was unaware of the IFES district program. IFES, with CTO support, defended its decision to by-pass the Ministry of Local Governance, calling it "centralized decentralization" and an effort to control local level activities. The Assessment, however, agrees with UNDP, that the relevant national level authorities should be aware of the program activities and locations.

The Assessment also found a general lack of coordination between IFES and NDI. Although they had worked together on one workshop, their programs and activities are not coordinated. This could be addressed through the monthly USAID SO-4 grantee meetings recommended by the Assessment, but for future activities, as discussed in the IR4.2 section, programming activities for IR4.2 at the national and local levels should be more integrated.

NDI opened its office in Ghana in 1996 and began SO-4 grant operations in 1997. The Assessment found that NDI program implementation had been significantly affected by staffing turnovers. The Team found remnants of serious friction between the second NDI Field Director and USAID/Ghana, which appear to have resulted in the recall of the NDI Field Director. The third, and current Country Director is a dynamic, experienced political professional who arrived last year. She has spent considerable time and effort into mending fences, and refocusing the program in areas where she believes NDI could make more of an impact using more cost-effective mechanisms. The second and current Legislative Advisor also arrived last year. He has international legislative counsel experience, and has been building a network of contacts within Parliament. The joint efforts appear to be working, as the Assessment

---

<sup>3</sup> The Assessment found USAID/Ghana uses a figure of \$1.9m available for ECSELL activities at the end of the election activities, while IFES/W told the Assessment that \$2.1m was available, of which 30% was used for continued election activities. Thus, according to IFES it only had a total of \$1.40m available at the end of the election grant for ECSELL activities.

was told by a Parliamentary committee clerk that NDI's image in Parliament had significantly improved with the arrival of the current NDI team.

The NDI local staff is comprised of 4 key staff who focus on civic and legislative programs and project administration. NDI does not anticipate hiring additional staff to manage its subgrants, as the Country Director intends to be directly involved. The NDI Country Director has developed a team approach in NDI's administration of activities and is providing the local staff with on-the-job training.

NDI monitors its activity performance through staff reporting and progress meetings. At the end of each workshop it administers a questionnaire. NDI has been slow to develop the performance indicators and is developing a parliamentary matrix and civic data sheet as discussed in the IR.4.1 and IR4.2 sections. Although the NDI/ Ghana office is responsible for day-to-day implementation of the program, grant management is done from NDI/W. At the time of the Assessment, the NDI Field Director reports back to NDI/W on a bi-weekly basis with an official written report of activities, and attaches copies of all activity reports and other documentation. The quarterly reports submitted to USAID/Ghana are prepared at NDI/W based on these summaries, with input from the local office. Subgrant proposals are screened by NDI/Ghana, but requires NDI/W approval for all funding.

This centralized management control outside of Ghana, has resulted in time consuming and expensive consultations between NDI/W and NDI/Ghana; both which were reflected in the implementation of activities and expensive nature of the program. According to NDI's 1997 budget notes incorporated into the Grant Agreement, Washington "direct project management, oversight and support" required time of the Regional Director (project management), Program Officer (daily operations), Program Assistant and Regional Assistant (administration), logistics staff (international travel) and others. As of 4/30/99, more than \$70,000 had been spent on phone bills. Although the level of Washington support has been significantly lowered in NDI's proposed budget to start 8/1/99, it still includes 4 (part-time) Washington based staff, with the Program Officer budgeted at 75% time.<sup>5</sup>

Funding for the NDI grant is an issue. USAID/Ghana will not fully fund the \$3m grant because of USAID/W budget cuts in SO-4 funding. As a result, NDI had to reprioritize activities and funding for the lower grant total of \$1.9m. NDI submitted a proposed revised workplan and budget to USAID in June. This proposal has not yet been approved by AID, nor at the time of the Assessment, had negotiations begun between USAID and NDI. Despite this, NDI is implementing the revised workplan and budget which have serious programmatic implications, such as cutting the position of Legislative Advisor at the end of September and ending the program on 2/28/00 instead of 12/31/00. The proposed grant end date also has other serious staffing ramifications, such as the probable departure of the current Country Director who is on leave from a full-time US job and who may have to return to that job when her one year option to return ends in September.

Although the workplan submitted by NDI has been shaped by on-going discussions between NDI and USAID/Ghana, the Assessment recommends that USAID immediately and formally negotiate the remaining phase of the grant with NDI, taking a serious look at the proposed budget allocations. This budget reflects the Washington-based management costs at the expense of in-country program activities. The Assessment also recommends that NDI consider delegating authority to its local field office in order to rationalize management and reduce the need for such extensive field-headquarters consultations. With a different allocation of funds, it should be possible to keep activities running through 12/00/00.

Grantee reporting, in general, as discussed above, has been timely and meets most of the grant requirements. The IFES report does provide gender data and extensive information on its monitoring aspects of the grant. The quarterly report would benefit with the addition of a table quantifying the activities undertaken during the quarter and total grant activities to date. For example, a table listing all 20 districts, disaggregated by organization (CSO or DA), and gender, listing the number of participants per workshop or training. It could also be used to track the results of the number of policies changed as a result of CSO input, and later incorporate information on the subgrant program. This could also benefit NDI reporting which is descriptive and which mentions numbers of participants and the status of Parliament within the text. NDI's table could reflect the different IR4.1 and IR4.2 activities, listing

---

<sup>5</sup> Per NDI, Washington-based expenses in the proposed workplan and budget account for less than 9% of the total proposed expenditures.

the number of participants (disaggregated by gender) and location, as well quantifiable information on Parliament. Both tables should include grant targets as well as actual results.

Neither grantee has started its subgrant program. It is the impression of the Assessment that the local IFES office does not yet realize the magnitude of implementing a nationwide subgrant program and the extent of the level of effort that will be required to screen proposals, issue subgrants, monitor implementation, ensure subgrantee financial accountability and adherence to regulations. Besides the administrative problems inherent in administering this program, for programmatic reasons discussed in IR4.2, the Assessment does not recommend this subgrant component.

NDI/Ghana intends to solicit and vet subgrant proposals from among CSOs participating in IR4.2, based on the CSO's ability to contribute to IR4.1 or IR4.2, and on their institutional capacity to administer the subgrant-funded activities. Subgrants will be incrementally funded, with subsequent tranches of subgrant funding dependent on the receipt of acceptable reports. This system reflects NDI's Washington-based management focus. Proposals are approved and managed by NDI Washington. "The (subgrantee) reports are due to NDI Washington, D.C. usually on a bi-monthly basis. Also, the disbursement of funds are contingent upon receiving and approval of the financial and narrative reports. Besides this constant communication via phone, fax and e-mail between the subgrantee and Washington DC program staff is also maintained." (NDI memo 7/21/99, pg 2). NDI/W subsequently informed the Assessment that this system was adopted globally "to ensure reasonable care in managing public monies" and that the local office has "complete access to all information on the institute's grants, sub grants and finances." (NDI letter dated 8/10/99). USAID/Ghana is not consulted on subgrants and is informed in the quarterly report.

NDI/Ghana has sent the first subgrant proposal to NDI/W for approval. This approval process is expected to take 2 weeks. NDI/Ghana expects they will issue 2-3 subgrants for a total of about \$80,000.

### **3.5.3. Recommendations**

Specific recommendations were included in the management discussion above. However, in general the Assessment recommends:

- The existing SO-4 team mechanism be expanded and used more at the Mission level. The expanded team would include the Controller and Contract Office representatives, an Embassy political officer and a representative of USIS. This would ensure coordination not only within the Mission but within the larger USG D/G assistance program and a wider dissemination of information. The Assessment also noted an active AOJ (Administration of Justice) program managed out of Washington and recommends that its representative be invited to participate in SO-4 meetings whenever in country.
- The SO-4 expanded team meet with grantees and other interested SO-officers on a monthly basis. Regular information sharing between members could be supplemented by brief presentations from visiting USG D/G missions, other D/G donors or even a specific topic, such as subgrantee management done by the Contracts Office.
- The grants be amended to update the program descriptions, expected outputs and reporting requirements. Grantees should be providing more information to USAID/Ghana which USAID/Ghana should use for monitoring purposes and to justify continued levels of DG funding with USAID/W.
- The two grantee Field Office Directors be delegated sufficient authority by their respective headquarters to manage the program and its activities from Ghana, and be provided with relevant Washington-based grant information so that they have a total picture of the grant and its finances.

## 4. Conclusions

The Assessment Team found genuine commitment and enthusiasm for implementing SO-4. However the activities implemented to date under the SO have been too broad and dispersed for it to have the impact anticipated at the strategic objective level.

According to USAID/Ghana's D/G Performance Monitoring Plan, the 1998 results for Indicator No. 1 "Percentage of legislative initiatives amended/proposed by MPs; and percentage of those that are the result of civic input" are almost on target. However, with the large number of donors assisting Parliament, and NDI's initial targeting of individual MPs, the Assessment is unable to attribute the increase in percentage to the SO-4 program. The Assessment is also unable to attribute the increase in civic input for the measurement: "Percentage of above that directly reflects civic input" to SO-4 for the same reasons.

NDI's new focused approach on legislative drafting, and assisting parliamentary staff instead of individual parliamentarians, has the possibility to make a visible difference on the measurement "Number of legislative initiative proposed by MPs." However, this impact assumes the continued work of the Legislative Advisor in Parliament.

Although the Assessment Team found signs of active public participation at all levels, the 1998 results for Indicator No. 2. "Number of local government decisions in project districts reached through participatory mechanisms" is below target. The Assessment believes that this indicator does not adequately measure the extent of public participation. However, the indicator could be an effective measurement for SO-4 assistance if it measured the difference between assisted and non-assisted districts rather than the increased number of policy changes made within assisted districts.

The lack of attributable impact at the SO-4 strategy level is a direct result of the broad-based, scattered nature of the IR activities undertaken to date. Although both grantees, most notably NDI, are working to better focus their programs on SO-4 essentials, it is too early to see any results from that refocus. NDI's new focus is just now getting started, and the Assessment doubts that the CSO portion of this first ESCCELL program could be turned into an advocacy activity at this stage in its implementation. The type of CSOs participating would benefit more from a micro-enterprise, micro-credit program. This, however, is not the objective of SO-4.

Although SO-4 was designed with a \$10m funding level for 3 years, actual funding has only been about \$1.4m a year. And with the FY00 reduction, only about \$600,000 will be available for IR activities. This means that SO-4 can no longer afford to maintain the current expenditure levels of the three IRs, and will have to take a serious look at its priorities and what it wants to fund. The cuts, felt so far only in the NDI grant, will require a more focused, concentrated and cost-effective approach to ensure impact from the limited amount of funds available.

The FY99 funding will take both grants through to the end of their grant completion dates (NDI's end date depends on its allocation of its remaining resources). Consequently, the Mission needs to explore now how it might wish to proceed after the conclusion of these grants. The Assessment recommends that the Mission revisit its SO-4 strategy to see how it could make more of an impact, perhaps using different set of implementation mechanisms, or perhaps through a return to the original set of objectives.

The original "Enhanced Civic Participation and Accountable Governance" objective could be re-looked at with, for example, a tight focus on an issue such as corruption or the rule of law. Corruption flourishes with ignorance and makes accountable government difficult. Participation could be focused on anti-corruption activities such as lobbying for transparency and enforcement of anti-corruption laws. Public empowerment could be achieved through mass media dissemination of information on fees and public salaries, the cost of corruption in lost government revenues, and on who to go to with complaints.

For future activities, this could work into the current IRs, if IR4.1 focused on Parliamentary committees and

legislation addressing problems of corruption; if IR4.2 could support civic advocacy programs focusing on the issue of corruption and transparency; and if IR4.3 could focus on accountability issues for the district-level authorities. This would also help the decentralization effort which is hampered by accountability issues. The issue of accountability is also a critical one in an election year, when the tendency to use government resources for party purposes, such as campaigning, increases. This focus would also correspond with the Department of State's new anti-corruption effort in Africa as described in SECSTATE 112097. The Department intends to work with 3-4 countries in Africa on good governance and anti-corruption activities following a World Bank "integrity diagnostic survey." It appears additional funds might be available for the selected countries, and the Assessment strongly encourages USAID/Ghana to explore the possibility of being included in this effort.

The 2000 elections will also require a re-thinking of SO-4 implementation. The elections will have direct impact on IR4.1 activities with Parliament as all of the MPs are up for re-election. These elections are also an important political milestone, as they will result in the first transfer of power from one democratically elected president to another. The last transfer of power occurred 18 years ago, by non-democratic means. These elections will also begin Ghana's transition into a post-Rawlings era. As noted by Political Scientist E. Gymah-Boadi, the political machinery built over Rawling's 18 year rule could make the post-Rawling's transition "traumatic" and a source of real concern.

For Ghana's democratic transition to continue, it must pass this difficult benchmark. As stated by Political Scientist Naomi Chazan, "the variety of regime types in Ghana is an indication of their lack of durability; no government, whether authoritarian or democratic, has been able to survive for any significant length of time." (Chazan, page 93). With Ghana's democratic transition at a critical juncture, the Assessment believes that now is not the time for USAID to cut its D/G assistance. The democratic transition is not complete and continued financial and diplomatic support will be an essential factor in assisting Ghana avoid a repetition of its post-independence political history. The Assessment urges USAID/Ghana to actively lobby USAID/W for an increase in D/G funds for the 2000 electoral process, not just for election assistance, but to support Ghana's continued democratic transition into the post-Rawlings era.

## **Annex A**

### **Scope of Work**

#### **Background**

USAID began working in the democracy and governance sector in Ghana in 1994 to provide significant support to the electoral process. The Mission awarded a three-year \$9.5 million grant to the International Foundation for Electoral Assistance (IFES) to provide technical assistance and commodities support to Ghana's Independent Electoral Commission. The goal of Project STEP (Supporting the Electoral Process) was to support the consolidation of democracy in Ghana through creating an open and credible voter registry and increase confidence and broaden participation in the electoral process. A major accomplishment was avoiding an opposition boycott of the elections as happened in 1992.

After the success of the elections and STEP, the Mission began assessing the post-election environment in Ghana and designed a broader, long-term strategic objective with the overall objective of Enhanced Civic Participation and Accountable Governance. This framework ran into problems during the 2000 R4 reporting period where it was revealed that the objective was too broad and unrealistic given the tightening of resources available for democracy and governance strategies in Africa.

Over the past two years, USAID/Ghana, along with those concerned with democracy and governance (D/G) in AID/Washington, have made significant advances in its understanding of D/G frameworks. In particular, it is now clear that important D/G results can and must be achieved through focused objectives and programs that do not spread limited resources too thinly. This issue, as well as the need for a better developed and more manageable performance monitoring plan, was at the fore of concerns raised in the FY2000 R4 review. At the same time, USAID/Ghana has faced consistently declining funding levels for its D/G programs, further highlighting the need for refining and focusing its D/G strategic objective and results framework.

In response to the need for more monitoring, as highlighted in the 2000 R4 review, USAID/Ghana decided to submit a revised strategic objective for democracy and governance in November 1998. While the old strategy provided a comprehensive framework for addressing D/G problems in Ghana, it was too broad for the financial resources the Mission has available and it failed to adequately elucidate the important connections between program elements.

The revised SO-4 has been designed to fill an essential gap in donor activity and work toward the long-term process of democratic consolidation in Ghana. While credible elections are the sine qua non of the democratic process, an active civil society and a responsible, accountable government are widely considered to be crucial in the democratic consolidations. This revised SO will facilitate the consolidation of democratic gains made in Ghana by instituting channels of input between civil society and policy makers at the national and local level. Increased civic participation at the national and local levels will lead to a sense of ownership of government, and will go a long way toward creating the conditions of transparency and accountable governance in Ghana.

#### **Principles for Narrowing the Strategic Framework:**

This revision exercise has been shaped by the following priorities:

- Create a more focused strategic plan that helps the Mission: a) make programming choices, b) track implementation and results, and c) convey a clear programming vision to host country institutions.
- Maintain the same general focus on improving governance through interaction of civil society and governing institutions, in keeping with the original problem analysis.
- Narrow down the number of D/G sub-sectors covered by the results framework in order to keep the strategy

within the Mission's manageable interest.

- Create a logically consistent and achievable strategy by assuring that IRs are closely linked both to the Strategic Objective and to each other.
- Clarify the level of resources required to implement a coherent, realistic strategy, as well as the losses that would result from budget cuts.

In other words, the exercise was not intended to create a new strategy but rather to focus on an existing one. The Mission is keenly aware of concerns about limited capacity to report D/G results over the past two years and wants to be able to do so without further delays. A major redirection when ongoing programs are in place would jeopardize that goal. Moreover, the Mission believes the existing strategy was aimed in the right direction; it simply needed to be better defined.

The strategy revision process has been comprehensive. A review of current programs was undertaken, partners have been consulted on implementation, indicator development and monitoring, and problems in attaining baseline and progress data from implementing partners have been addressed. The revisions were made by a team with significant familiarity with the Ghanaian political scene that took that political assessment into account as they completed their work. No assistance program, let alone a relatively small one such as Ghana's can resolve all development problems, the goal of this strategy is to help address some critical difficulties in democracy and governance.

The main shortcomings of the old Strategic Objective "Enhanced Accountable Governance" were its breadth and the lack of a coherent and manageable set of IRs to achieve it. The new SO "Public Policy Decisions Better Reflect Civic Input" maintains USAID/Ghana's emphasis on improving accountability in governance through civic participation, but focuses specifically on the role of civil society in combination with representative institutions.

In response to the need to create a more focused strategy, the following specific changes were made to the existing results framework:

- Strategic Objective scaled down and made more specific.
- IR on elections support removed to a short-term, targeted Special Objective which will be formally submitted at a later date. It was determined that this IR is not manageable even under the Mission's originally expected funding levels and is not essential to the achievement of the new SO, though the Special Objective is an important part of the consolidation of democracy in Ghana.
- IRs on parliament and local government specified to identify enhanced effectiveness to represent civic interests rather than issues of capacity such as physical infrastructure or technical skills.
- Three separate IRs on civil society and its role in policy making condensed into one targeted at increasing civil society's ability to affect decision making.
- The three current IRs were formulated to be closely linked to the objective and to each other.
- Indicators for the SO and IR levels identified in consultation with implementing partners: agreement on the provision of baseline data attained, providing basis for target setting.

## **Results Framework**

The objective is supported by three interlocking Intermediate Results, two of which focus on Parliament and District Assemblies, respectively, and a third which focuses on civil society at the local and national levels and provides the linking mechanism that holds the strategy together. Parliament and District Assemblies lack skills, resources and experience in terms of both openness to civic input and effectiveness to translate that input into public policy. Resolving these shortcomings is a main focus of the strategy, but this is only part of the equation that results in

public policy better representing civic input. The other necessary element is the civic input itself.

Figure 2 is not part of the strategic results framework, but is provided to show that the Mission has identified specific program areas as essential for achieving the intermediate results, and the strategic objective. It is largely self-explanatory though a few points may be made about a slight difference in the nature of the local and national level programs. As may be seen from the chart, civil society activities are essentially the same at the local and national levels, though the range of management and advocacy tools the national level CSOs need to master is broader than that for local level CSOs.

The main difference between local and national level programming is the nature of the work with the representative bodies - Parliament and the District Assemblies. In both cases, fostering interaction between civil society and elected representatives is key. However, as indicated by lack of a specific program focus are on local government capacity, there is emphasis on providing skills and resources to District Assemblies beyond consultative skills, knowledge of the governance systems, and knowledge of joint decision making methods which are provided through practical training and facilitation in participating districts. One reason for this difference is the fact that the local decision making generally doesn't require the same levels of technical expertise as national policy making. Another is that several other donors are providing various types of capacity assistance to local government, including such essential areas as revenue collection and identification of new revenue sources which facilitate local government capacity to influence policy.

USAID's comparative advantage and manageable interest is in facilitating processes of consultation at the local level, an essential step that is necessary to institutionalize Ghana's commitment to participatory democracy at the local level.

An extensive program monitoring and evaluation structure is in place for the local level work and is being developed for the national level work (see discussion below). Indicators are not identified for sub-results in Figure 2 for two reasons: a) the subresults were defined for planning and communication purposes, not as part of the Mission's official results framework, and b) it does not make sense to select out a few indicators for sub results performance when a complete monitoring plan is in place.

### **Scope of Work**

The Assessment Team will travel to Ghana to review and assess USAID/Ghana's Strategic Objective #4, "Public Policy Decision Better Reflect Civic Input." The team consisting of Sue Nelson- Team Leader, Dr. J.. Michael Turner- Political Scientist, and Beatrice Duncan- Local Ghana Expert, will meet with Mission staff, principle grantees, customers and stakeholders as required in order to assist the Mission to make decisions regarding program priorities in light of significant budget cuts effective FY 2000. The team will consist of two US based USAID democracy and governance evaluation experts and one local Ghanaian consultant.

The assessment team will analyze existing data and use focus groups and loosely structured interviews and observations to obtain empirical evidence to provide recommendations to the Mission. The units of analysis for the team will be individual activity participants from parliament, local government and civil society organizations, parliament as an institution, statutory district assemblies and entire participating civil society organizations.

In addition to individual activity participants, the team will also interact with non-participants within those institutions or organizations. The team will also visit at least two non project district assemblies and meet with several non-project civil society organizations. This will assist the Mission in assessing performance based on comparative analysis. It will also guide the Mission in future decisions about the value of adding control elements to its monitoring and evaluation plan. When feasible, data will be disaggregated by gender and geographic region (north, middle and south).

The team will thoroughly review the entire portfolio of the Mission's democracy and governance activities through examining documents and interviewing Mission SO-4 and grantee staff. The team will submit a draft design and strategy. Shortly after the team will finalize the design strategy and methodology with input from the SO-4 team.

Once the methodology and strategy are approved, the team will apply the methodology to the units of analysis and base their findings, conclusions and recommendations on empirical evidence.

### **Role of the Team Leader**

Principally, the contractor will focus on the following issues:

- Determine if the SO#4 Team is effectively and efficiently managing the program.
- Make recommendations if needed for improving the SO Team management.
- Assess how competently the Mission's grantees manage their activities and field operations. This will include answers to the following: Are they effectively planning, implementing, measuring results and communicating their intended activities? Are they adhering to Agency guidance on program management and implementation? Does the team have suggestions for improving Mission-grantee communications?
- Provide recommendations for a scenario where USAID/Ghana program sustains significant funding cuts. The report will directly comment on what activities does she recommend maintaining and which activities/results are more likely to be achieved during the remainder of the project period (until 12/01). The team leader will suggest future priorities in light of Ghana's December 2000 general elections and the anticipated high level of attention placed on the campaign and election.
- Conclude whether or not the partners' intended end results are sustainable to the degree anticipated. If not, suggest measures to ensure sustainability.
- Identify opportunities for grantee/other donor/other Mission SO coordination that are there but are not currently being exploited.

### **International Consultant/Political Scientist Focus**

Principally, the contractor will focus on the following:

- Identify and discuss the extent that project activities are leading to anticipated results. Assess performance of activities in parliament, national and locally based civil society organizations and local government in target districts based on approved development hypothesis, underlying assumptions, and the results framework. Examine to what degree can the Mission and its grantees claim attribution for the results reported thus far (through FY98 and the first annual portfolio review of FY 99)
- Assess the impact of the activities on the direct beneficiaries including:
  1. Individual members of parliament (MPs) and staff
  2. Parliament as an institution
  3. Individually trained CSO leaders (national and local)
  4. CSOs as organizations
  5. District government officials trained
  6. District government as a whole
- Assess if the project is having the desired impact by working with selected individuals of institutions and organizations rather than whole institutions and organizations.
- Identify to what extent the needs of the beneficiaries (at the levels of parliament, local government and local civil society organizations) have been effectively identified by the Mission and its grantees. Comment on how well the needs of the program customers are being met. Analyze whether the identified needs of the beneficiaries are valid given the program objectives. Determine if the beneficiaries are clear on the goals of USAID funded assistance.

**Expert on Political Processes in Ghana**

The consultant will focus on the following:

- Provide background information on Ghana political situation to team members.
- Analyze documents for factual relevance in the Ghanaian context.
- Make local field trips to assist Team Leader

## **Annex B Bibliography**

**Berinyuu, Abraham**, History of the Presbyterian Church in Northern Ghana, Asempa Publishers, Ghana, 1997

**Chazan, Naomi**, Ghana, Problems of Governance and the Emergence of Civil Society, in Democracy in Developing Countries, Volume II: Africa, Larry Diamond Ed., Lynne Reiner Publishers, 1988

### **CIDA**

“From Service Delivery Toward Governance for Sustainability.” Report on the Ghana Water Program Evaluation, Thematic Papers, Volume II, Edward T. Jackson, Ed., Ottawa, 4/98

“From Service Delivery Toward Governance for Sustainability.” Final Evaluation Report, 7/98  
District Capacity Building Project (DISCAP) 400/18452, Annex A- Project Summary, 2/99

### **Civil Rights Education for Democracy and Human Rights:**

Letter to the Committee on Constitutional And Legal Office of Parliament, from Goerge T. Tarbah SNR, asking for a time extension for the submission of their memorandum on the Immigration and Citizenship Bill, dated June 30, 1999

**Crabbe, V.C.R.A.C.**, Teaching Legislative Drafting: The Commonwealth Experience from the Statue Law Review, Volume 19, Number 2. 1998

### **Danida**

Danish Support to District Assemblies (DSDA II), undated

Evaluation Report on Danish Support to District Assemblies Project, undated

### **European Commission**

Cooperation between Ghana and the European Union, Annual Report 1997

Digest of Community Resources Available for Financing the Activities of NGOs and other Governmental and/or Decentralized Bodies Representing Civil Society in the Fields of Development Cooperation and Humanitarian Aid, April 1998

### **GOG**

Proposals for UNDP/EU Support to the National Governance Programme, Submitted to UNDP, 10/98

Minutes of Donor/Steering Committee Members on the Policy Framework for Co-ordinating Capacity Building for Decentralized Management in Ghana. 10/21/98

Minutes of Donor/Steering Committee Members on the Policy Framework for Co-ordinating Capacity Building for Decentralized Management in Ghana. 10/28/98

Draft Legislative Drafting Syllabus by V.C.R.A.C. Crabbe, Commissioner, Statue Law Revision, Attorney General's Department, Republic of Ghana, 4/22/99

National Survey Report: Conflict Prevention, Conflict Resolution, Conflict Management, National Institutional Renewal Program, National Governance Programme, 6/99

### **GTZ**

Programme for Rural Action, Decentralization and the Institutionalization of Participation, Final Draft 3/10/96

Programme for Rural Action, Country Paper, Decentralization and Local Government in Ghana, undated.

Programme for Rural Action, Workshop Report, 23-26 November 1998, with updated tables dated 11/25/98

The Programme for Rural Action, a bilateral Ghanaian-German Technical Cooperation Project in support of the Ghanaian Decentralization Process, 6/99

**E. Gyimah-Boadi**, Ghana: The Challenges of Consolidating Democracy, in the State, Conflict, and Democracy in Africa, Richard Joseph, Ed., Lynne Reinner, 1999

**IEA**

Democratic Governance in Ghana under the 1992 Constitution, Occasional Paper No. 4, 1996  
Government and the People, Outlook for Democracy in Ghana, E.A. Boateng, 1996  
Intellectuals and Government: A Tale of Uneasy Partnership, Kwesi Yankah, Occasional Paper No. 6, 1997  
Legislative Alert, Vol. 5, No. 2: The Privilege of the Media in the Ghana Law of Defamation, Justice R.J. Hayfron-Benjamin, 5/98  
Legislative Alert, Vol 5., No. 4, The Judiciary and Democratic Governance in Ghana, Justice I.K. Abban, 7/98  
The Right to Information, and Freedom of the Media in Ghana's Fourth Republic, Occasional Paper No. 18, 1999

**IFES**

Civil Society and Local Government in Twenty Districts in Ghana: Surprises, Problems and Opportunities, IFES Project ECSELL Baseline Assessment, 3/98  
Report on Project ECSELL Workshop I, "Structures and Functions of the District Assembly and the Role of Civil Society in a Democracy," 5/98  
Report on Project ECSELL Workshop II, "Collaborative Analytic Problem Solving," 9/98  
Report on Project ECSELL Workshop III, "Strategic Planning and Resource Management," 12/98  
IFES Grant Modification No.9 for Cooperative Agreement No. 641-0133-A-00-4028, dated 5/3/99  
Report on IFES Workshop IV, 5/99  
Making Democracy Work: IFES Project ECSELL Midterm Evaluation Report, 5/99.  
IFES Quarterly Report for period 1/1/99- 3/31/99, undated.  
Learning How to Make Democracy Work, The IFES Project in Ghana, Midterm Evaluation, 6/99  
IFES Workshop Programme, Workshop 5: Promoting Effective Civic-Government Collaboration  
IFES letter to USAID/Ghana on IFES comments on the Assessment Draft Report, 8/10/99.

**National Commission for Civic Education**

District Level Elections, March 1994  
The Right to Vote and Political Tolerance, '96 Presidential and Parliamentary Elections, undated.  
Unit Committees, May 1998

**National Institutional Renewal Programme, National Governance Programme**

National Workshop on Governance in Ghana (16-18 June, 1997), Workshop Report, Volume 1, 2/98  
Ghana: Accountability and Transparency for Good Governance, The Grassroots Perspective, Survey Report. 4/98  
Report on the 2nd National Governance Workshop on Accountability and Transparency in Ghana, 14-15 May 1998  
Registration and Profiles of Governance Projects Supported by Government of Ghana and Development Partners, Volume 2, 2/99  
Summary of the National Governance Programme and activities funded. Undated.  
Governance Unit, Activity Planning Schedule: 1999-2001. Undated.

**NDI**

NDI Grant No. 641-G-00-97-00233, dated 10/1/97  
NDI Memo dated 11/18/98 from Stephen Terravecchia, NDI Legislative Advisor to Sean Hall, USAID/Ghana on "Matrix for recording Quality of Parliamentary Debates."  
NDI subgrant proposal from the Coalition of NGO's in Youth Development (undated) and the NDI e-mail on subgrantee questions from Antoinette Pearson, Program Officer for West Africa, NDI/W, 1/21/99  
NDI subgrant proposal from the International Association for the Advancement of Women in Africa, for a "Workshop on the Empowerment of Women for the Democratization Process," 1/25/99  
NDI Memo dated 1/28/99 from Frimpong Addo to Sean Hall, USAID/Ghana on "NDI Matrix for assessing NGOs/CSOs impact on public policies."  
NDI subgrant proposal from the Ghana Coalition on the Right of the Child for a "Civic Advocacy Training Workshop, " undated.  
NDI subgrant proposal from Ghana Committee for Human and Peoples' Rights, Ghana on "the Role and Impact of

Members of Parliament on the Protection of Human Rights in Ghana." 2/99  
 NDI Memo dated 2/18/99 from Stephen Terravecchia, NDI Legislative Advisor to Gregg Wiitala, USAID/Ghana on "Democracy and Governance Performance Monitoring: Parliament."  
 NDI subgrant proposal from PROCOM for "Civic Advocacy Workshops," 3/31/99  
 NDI training proposal "Establishing a Legal Drafting Unit Within the Parliament of Ghana, Legislative Drafting Training...", 4/99  
 NDI Quarterly Report for period 1/1/99-3/31/99 dated 5/5/99  
 NDI Memo dated May 5, 1999 from Stephen Terravecchia to Cassandra Woods, NDI on "Wa District Town Meeting Report."  
 NDI subgrant proposal from the Ghana Human Rights Coalition for a "Policy Analysis/Lobbying and Advocacy Workshop," 5/26/99  
 NDI proposal for modification for its "1999 Workplan: December 1998 - February 2000" dated June 1, 1999.  
 NDI Memo dated 6/1/99 from Stephen Terravecchia to Sean Hall, USAID/Ghana on "Democracy and Governance Performance Monitoring; Ghana Parliament, Third Session, First Meeting."  
 The Second Parliament of the Fourth Republic of Ghana: A Baseline Assessment. Undated.  
 NDI subgrant proposal from the Leaders of Tomorrow Foundation, Kumasi for Town Hall Public Meetings. Undated.  
 NDI Memorandum dated June 30, 1999 from Cassandra Woods, Country Director to the USAID Evaluation Team on "Program Evaluation." Memo & attachments listed below received July 9, 1999.  
     Appendix #1, NDI Memo from Paul Nuti, Program Officer for Civic Programs to NDI Ghana Team on "Civic Advocacy Seminar Report, 3/30/98  
     Appendix #2, NGO Orientation Visits to Parliament, Summary of Visits 1-3, 1998  
     Appendix #3, Concept document for NGO Roundtable, 1998  
     Appendix #4, "Civic Advocacy: Civil Society Impacting Public Policy" Seminar (11/30-12/1/98), Agenda, Summary Report, Trainers Report.  
     Appendix #5, Agendas for workshops of "Civic Advocacy: Civil Society Impacting Public Policy, 12/98 - 5/99  
 NDI Memorandum dated July 21, 1999 from Cassandra Woods, Country Director to the USAID Evaluation Team on "Subgrant Issues."  
 NDI letter to Sean Hall dated 8/10/99 on "NDI Response to Assessment Report of Strategic Objective 4."

## **UNDP**

Good Governance and Public Sector Reform, Programme Support Document GHA/97/001, 2/13/98

## **USAID**

SO-4: Enhanced Civic Participation and Accountable Governance, Strategy Document, approved 9/30/97  
 USAID/Ghana FY 1999 Results Review and Resource Request, Undated.  
 SO-4: Public Policy Decisions Better Reflect Civic Input, Six month review: 10/1/97-3/31/98  
 SO-4: Public Policy Decisions Better Reflect Civic Input, Six month review: 4/1/98-9/30/98  
 SO-4: Public Policy Decisions Better Reflect Civic Input, Six month review: 10/1/98-3/31/99  
 USAID/Ghana: Democracy and Governance, Performance Monitoring Plan, Strategic Objective #4: Public Policy Decisions Better Reflect Civic Input. Undated.  
 USAID/Ghana, FY2000 Results Review and Resource Request. Undated.  
 SECSTATE 162639 Review of Ghana's R4 Report for FY 2000, 9/3/98  
 USAID/Ghana: FY 2001, R4. Undated  
 Revisions to USAID/Ghana's Democracy and Governance Objective, Former Strategic Objective #4:  
     Enhanced Civic Participation and Accountable Governance. Revised Strategic Objective #4: Public Policy Decisions Better Reflect Civic Input. Undated.  
 Letter from Sean Hall, D/G Advisor to Dr. Snook, IFES on Assessment Mission, dated 5/25/99  
 SECSTATE 112097, Input Request to the Africa Bureau's Anti-Corruption Action Plan, 6/16/99  
 USAID/Ghana Program Office, Comments to Assessment Team Draft Report, 8/10/99

**World Bank**

Letter dated July 8, 1998 from Peter Harrold, Country Director, to Justice D.F. Annan, Speaker of Parliament  
on areas of possible WB support for Parliament.

Aide Memoire on World Bank Identification/Preparation Mission, Parliamentary Component, 7/8/98

World Bank invitation to donors for a Government Donor Meeting to Review Assistance to Parliament on 11/4/98.

Included was information on Canadian and UNDP assistance to Parliament.

## **Annex C**

### **Persons and Agencies Contacted**

#### **Canadian High Commission**

Mark Mostovac, First Secretary (Development).

#### **Civil Society and Community Based Organizations**

##### **Accra**

**African American Association of Ghana**, Phil Moore, President

**Amnesty International-NGO Human Rights Coalition**, George M. Naykene

**Business & Professional Women of Ghana**, Ellen Avorgbor, Administrative Secretary

**African Development Programme**, Charles Abbey, Director

**The African Society of International and Comparative Law**, Nama Asantewa Adu

**The Ark Foundation**, Angela Dwamena-Abogye

**Association for the Advancement of Women in Africa**, Kate Abbam, Vivian Nsiah

**Center for Conflict Resolution**, General Arnold Quainoo

**Center for Democracy & Development**, Accra. Professor Gymah Buadi

**Center for the Development of People**, Ben Lartey, Prince Mohammed, Alhasson Sumani ECSELL  
Trainers; Mr. Keat, Watson Fellow on loan to CEDP

**Civil Rights Education for Democracy and Human Rights**, Goerge T. Tarbah SNR, Executive Director; Elder  
Ivvin W. Kofa SNR, Co-Chairman.

**Ghana Agricultural Workers Union**, Mr. Offei-Nkansah, Deputy Secretary General

**Ghana Bar Association**, William Bofo, National Vice-President

**Ghana Human Rights NGO Coalition**, Ernest Teye-Topey, Campaign & Development Coordinator

**Ghana Journalist Association**, Bright Blewu, General Secretary

**Ghana Union of Traders Association**, G.K. Oferi

**The Institute of Economic Affairs (IEA)**: Dr. G.A. Apenteng, Executive Director; Professor Mike Oquaye,  
Director of Governance Unit; and Ambassador H. Van Hien Sekyi, Fellow and Former Ghanaian  
Ambassador to the UN.

**Organization Capacity Improvement Consultants**: Francis Sackitey Matey, Resident Consultant; Edward  
Akita, Consultant.

**Philip Foundation**, Boateng Mensah

**Save the Children Fund**, Alice Sena Lamptey

##### **Ada**

**Ewe Community**, G.K. Mensah, Financial Secretary

**Hairdresser's Association**, Abigail Ocloo, President

**Tailor's Association**, Charles Apafloe, Chairman

**Radio Ada**, Kofi Lewwer, Station Manager

##### **Apam**

**Hairdresser's Association**, Mercy Awortwe-Pratt, President

**Tailor's and Dressmakers Association**, Margaret Achison, Member

**Ghana Pentecostal Council**, Adumoh-Bossman Barden

##### **Kumasi**

**Leaders of Tomorrow**, S.K. Agyepong, Programme Manager

##### **Tamale**

**Amasachina, Self-Help Development Association**, Dr. Elsie Taylor, CUSO Volunteer, Collaborator on Women-

In-Development Program; Mumuni Abdulahi Zakaria, Deputy Program Director  
**Catholic Relief Services**, Mr. Zimmerman, Administrative Officer  
**Community Development & Youth Advisory Center**, Alhasi Hussein Zacharia, Director  
**Maatu-N-Tudu (Northern Women's Association)**, Grace Yane, Secretary; Yahay Halid-Baba, Member  
**Women's Development Agency**, Amina Mousah, Program Coordinator; Mohammed Nurudeen,  
Accountant/Administrator

#### **Tolon**

**Tuntuya Women's Organization**, Alima Issafu, Member

#### **Winneba**

**Ghana Drinking Bar Association** Rowland Quainoo, Secretary  
**Ghana Government Pensioners Association**, J.K. Mould, District Secretary  
**Tailors and Dressmakers Association**. Grace Love Osei, Chairman. Dixon Alexander-Kumah, Advisor

#### **Yendi**

**Lebginism Development Union**, Walvis Hundu, Representative  
**Tailors Association**, Mutawaw Kilu Wakasu  
**Pion Women's Association**, Adam Ahmad Grundow, Treasurer  
**Vegetable Grower's Association**

#### **Conferences/Meetings**

**National Institutional Renewal Programme (NIRP)**, National Governance Programme, Conference on Conflict  
Prevention, Management and Resolution for Peace, Stability and Development, Accra 6/24/99,  
**Parliament Committee of Constitutional, Legal and Parliamentary Affairs**, Public Hearing on Refugee Bill  
6/30/99.

#### **DANIDA**

Fred Pappoe, Programme Officer

#### **EU**

Camilla Christensen, Young Expert

#### **Friedrick Ebert Foundation**

Peter Schellschmidt, Resident Director  
Kwasi Afriyie Badu, Programmes Co-ordinator

#### **GTZ**

Reinhart Trenkle

#### **Government Institutions**

##### **Accra**

**Attorney General's Office**: Professor V.C.R.A.C. Crabbe  
**Commission on Human Rights and Administrative Justice**: Emile Short, Commissioner  
**Ministry for Local Government**: Francis Korbih, Deputy Minister  
**National Institutional Renewal Programme, National Governance Programme**: Leonara Awuo-  
Kyerematen, Program Manager

#### **Parliament:**

MP Mumuni Abudi Seidu, Deputy Majority Leader, Wa Constituency  
MP Theresa Adaho, Leader of the Women's Caucus, MP for Nkoranza  
MP Gladys Ansah, Deputy Minority Leader  
MP Francis Korbih, MP for Drapai Grapa  
MP Sallas Mensah. MP for Akim West  
MP Theresa Tagoe, MP for Ablekumah

Rex Owusu Ansah aka Nana Owusu Anesa Kokroko II, Clerk  
Dickson Antwi, Parliamentary Research Officer, Office of the Speaker

**Ada**

**District Assembly:**

D.K. Koomson, Acting District Coordinating Director  
Stephen Dansa, Assistant District Coordinating Director  
G.K. Mensah, District Information Officer  
Kofi Lewwer, Head Nonformal Education Center (Adult Education)

**Apam**

**District Assembly:**

Kow Angonbil, District Chief Executive  
Kizito Ballans, District Coordinating Director  
J.Y. Frempong, Chairman, District Finance and Administration Subcommittee  
Ernestina Ekumah, District Organiser  
Charles Enyimbil, Assembly Member  
Justice Essaiw, Assembly Member  
Cosmoyn Eozi, Assembly Member  
Godfried Essoman, Assembly Member  
Richard K. Yamoah, Assembly Member

**NCEE** Stephen Agyi-Yebod, Director

**Tamale**

**NCEE** Saani Abdul-Razak, Training Director  
Abdul Razak Yakah, Research Director

**Tolon**

**District Assembly**

Sulley Alhassan, District Executive Officer  
Monica Dufour, District Social Work Officer  
Joseph Awuni Abongo, Ghana Education Service

**Winneba**

**District Assembly**

Guy Sillo, District Coordinating Director  
F.K. Odei, District Budget Officer  
F. Osei-Antwi, District Planning Officer  
Ato Ghartey, District ECSELL Liaison Officer

**NCEE:** Albert Sam, Director

**Yendi**

**District Assembly**

Rudolph S. Kuuzegh, District Director of Development  
Mr. Kwame, District ECSELL Liaison Officer

**NCEE:** Daniel Bukari, District Director

**IFES**

Dr. Stephen L. Snook, Field Manager  
Frieda Ofori, Program Officer  
John Lervie, Project Administrator  
Albert Apetorgbor, Participant Observer for Ada  
Saibu Joseph Nabdow, Participant Observer for Tolon

Rowland Quainoo, Participant Observer for Winneba  
Ramatu Abdul-Rauf, Participant Observer for Yendi

**NDI**

Cassandra Woods, Resident Director  
Steve Terravecchia, Legislative Advisor  
Yaw Frimpong Addo, Civic Program Officer  
Abigail Burgessson, Legislative Assistant  
Margaret Quarcoo, Administrative Assistant

**UNDP**

Comfort Tetteh, Assistant Resident Representative  
Mizuho Yokoi, Programme Officer

**USAID/Ghana**

Sean Hall, Democracy and Governance Officer  
Gregg Wiitala, Program Officer  
Cleveland Thomas, Private Sector  
Peter Kresge, Education  
Raymond Edler, Grants Officer  
Victor Doke, SO-4 Contract Office Team Member  
Antoinette Djahlin, SO-4 Secretary  
Roger Lapp, Acting Controller  
Edmund Hallo, Acting SO-4 Controller Office Team Member

**USIS**

Brooks Anne Robinson, Director

**World Bank**

Peter Harold, Country Director

**Annex D**  
**SO-4 Results Framework and Measuring Tables**

## Calendar of Meetings

### Wednesday, June 23

19:25 Dr. Turner & Ms. Nelson arrive Accra

### Thursday, June 24

All day team meeting

09:30 Team with Gregg Wiitala and Sean Hall

10:30 Briefing by Sean Hall

12:30 Team with Gregg Wiitala and Sean Hall

### Friday, June 25

09:00 Team at conference NIRP, National Governance Programme.

12:00 Draft Workplan

16:30 Present Workplan to Gregg Wiitala & Sean Hall

### Saturday, June 26

Draft Report Outline

### Monday, June 28:

08:30 Team with Gregg Wiitala & Sean Hall

10:00 Deliver Report Outline

11:00 Team with NDI at NDI

14:00 Team with IFES at IFES

### Tuesday, June 29

10:00 Sean Hall with Ms. Nelson

11:30 MP Sallas Mensah at Parliament, Ms. Nelson & Ms. Duncan

11:30 Ghana Journalist Association- Dr. Turner

12:00 MP Francis Korbie at Parliament, Ms. Nelson & Ms. Duncan

13:30 Mizuho Yokoi at UNDP- Ms. Nelson

13:30 Professor Gymah Buadi at CDD - Dr. Turner

15:30 Cleveland Thomas, USAID Private Sector - Dr. Turner

16:00 Sean Hall with Ms. Nelson

### Wednesday, June 30

08:00 Peter Kresge, USAID Education- Dr. Turner

08:30 Reinhart Trenkle at GTZ- Ms. Nelson

08:30 NDI at their office with Cassandra & Steve- Dr. Turner

10:30 Meetings with CSOs at NDI- Dr. Turner

11:30 Annette Djahlin with Ms. Nelson

12:30 CSO/Parliamentary committee meeting at Parliament- Dr. Turner

14:00 IFES at their office - Ms. Nelson

### Thursday, July 1 (Holiday)

10:45 CDD Dr. Turner & Ms. Nelson

### Friday, July 2

08:30 NDI at their offices- Ms. Nelson

10:00 MP Gladice Assuah, Deputy Minority Leader at Parliament- Dr. Turner

10:30 MP Mumuni Abudi Seidu, Deputy Majority leader at Parliament- Dr. Turner

10:00 Victor Doke with Ms. Nelson

11:00 Leonara Awuo-Kyerematen, NIRP- Ms. Nelson  
12:00 Prof. Crabbe, Attorney General's Office- Dr. Turner  
12:30 Gregg Wiitala with Ms. Nelson  
14:00 IEA: Dr. George Apenteng, Prof. Mike Oquaye, Amb. Sekyi- Ms. Nelson & Dr. Turner

### **Saturday, July 3**

Review documents collected

### **Monday, July 5**

Dr. Turner to Tamale	Ms. Nelson to Ada
10:30 Hotel pick up	District Assembly
Fly to Tamale	CSO- Hairdressers Association
CSO- Women's Development Agency	CSO- Ewe Community
CSO- Amasachina (Self-help Dev Ass)	IFES Participant Observer
NCEE	CSO - Tailors Association
	Radio Ada

### **Tuesday July 6**

Dr. Turner to Yendi	Ms. Nelson & Ms. Duncan to Apam
NCEE	District Assembly
District Assembly	CSO- Ghana Pentecostal Council
CSO- Vegetable Growers Assoc	CSO - Hairdressers Association
CSO- PION Women's Association	CSO- Tailors & Dressmakers Assoc.
CSO- Tailors Association	
IFES Participant Observer	

### **Wednesday July 7**

Dr. Turner to Tolon	Ms. Nelson & Ms. Djahlin to Winneba
District Assembly	IFES Participant Observer
IFES Participant Observer	ESCELL Training Workshop
Tuntuya Women's Organization	CSO- Tailors & Dressmakers Assoc.
Return Tamale	District Assembly, Budget Director
CSO - Maata-N-Tudu	CSO - Pensioners Association
NGO- CRS	CSO- Drinking Bar Association
CSO- Community Dev & Youth	District Assembly, DCD, DPO, NCC

### **Thursday, July 8**

Dr. Turner return afternoon  
09:00 Mark Mostovac at CIDA- Ms. Nelson  
10:00 Brooks Robinson, USIS- Ms. Nelson  
11:00 Emile Short at CHRAJ- Ms. Nelson  
14:00 Fred Pappoe at Danida- Ms. Nelson  
15:00 Mrs. Christianson at EU- Ms. Nelson

### **Friday, July 9**

09:00 Friedrich Ebert Foundation- Dr. Turner  
11:00 Ghana Bar Association, Mr. Lawson - Dr. Turner

### **Saturday, July 10**

Draft report

### **Monday, July 12**

08:00 Ghana Agricultural Workers Union - Ms. Duncan  
09:15 Business & Professional Women Ghana - Ms. Duncan

10:00 Ghana Union of Traders Association - Ms. Duncan  
11:30 Telcom: Leaders of Tomorrow - Ms. Duncan  
11:00 Dickson Antwi, Parliamentary Research Officer - Dr. Turner  
13:30 Ghana Human Rights NGO Coalition - Ms. Duncan  
14:30 African Society of International & Comparative Law - Ms. Duncan  
14:30 World Bank, Peter Harold, Country Director- Dr. Turner  
15:30 African Development Programme- Ms. Duncan  
16:30 Center for Conflict Resolution - Ms. Duncan  
17:00 Deliver draft report

**Tuesday, July 13**

09:30 MP Teresa Tagoe, Op MP from Ablekuma- Dr. Turner & Ms. Duncan  
MP Theresa Adaho, MP from Nkoransah - Dr. Turner & Ms. Duncan  
14:00 Debrief SO-4  
  
21:15 Departure Dr. Turner & Ms. Nelson

## **Annex E**

### **Acronyms**

AOJ:	Administration of Justice
DA:	District Authorities
CBO:	Community Based Organization
CEDEP:	Center for Development of People
CDD:	Center for Democracy and Development
CIDA:	Canadian International Development Agency
CHRAJ:	Commission on Human Rights
CSO:	Civil Society Organization
CTO:	USAID/s Contractors Technical Officer
CUSO:	Canadian Volunteers
DCD:	District Coordinating Director
DCE:	District Chief Executive
D/G:	Democracy & Governance
ECSELL:	IFES Project called Enhancing Civil Society Effectiveness at the Local Level
EU:	European Union
FY:	Fiscal Year
GOG:	Government of Ghana
GTZ:	German Development Cooperation
IEA:	Institute of Economic Affairs
IFES:	International Foundation for Electoral Systems
IFES/G:	IFES office in Ghana
IFES/W:	IFES headquarters in Washington
IR:	Intermediate Result
MP:	Member of Parliament
NCEE:	National Commission for Civic Education
NDC:	National Democratic Party
NDI:	National Democratic Institute
NDI/G:	NDI office in Ghana
NDI/W:	NDI headquarters in Washington
NIRP:	National Institutional Renewal Programme
PO:	IFES Project ESCELL Participant Observer
SO:	Strategic Objective
UNDP:	United Nations Development Programme
USAID:	U.S. Agency for International Development
USAID/Ghana:	U.S. Agency for International Development in Ghana
USAID/W:	U.S. Agency for International Development in Washington
USIS:	United States Information Service

## Annex F Question Results

During the Assessment, the Assessment Team asked most of the Ghanaians interviewed a set of standard questions. The purpose of the questions was to determine if there was a difference in the responses between assisted beneficiaries and non-assisted persons and organizations. A comparative approach was undertaken as required by the Scope of Work. The questions were general in nature and covered participation and policy issues. They were not intended to measure the difference in knowledge on specific issues covered during grant-level training sessions. That grant-level type of evaluation should be done during the final evaluation of each SO-4-funded grant. The questions and findings for the broader SO-4-level assessment are detailed in this Annex.

A total of 61 persons were asked the same questions. We noted the location of the respondent, approximate age, gender, occupation and whether s/he had received SO-4 assistance. The respondents broke down into 45 men and 16 women. Of these 30 were assisted (12 NDI-assisted and 18 IFES-assisted) and 31 were not assisted by SO-4. There were 37 CSO respondents and 24 government respondents. The interviews were done in Accra and in 7 districts.

**Respondents by SO-4 Assisted or NonAssisted**

	Assisted			NonAssisted			Total
	M	F	T	M	F	T	
<b>CSO</b>	15	6	21	10	6	16	37
<b>Govt</b>	7	2	9	13	2	15	24
<b>Total</b>	22	8	30	23	8	31	61
<b>IFES</b>	15	3	18				18
<b>NDI</b>	7	5	12				12
<b>NonAssisted</b>				23	8	31	31
<b>Total</b>	22	8	30	23	8	31	61

**Respondents by Location**

	Accra			South			North		
	M	F	T	M	F	T	M	F	T
<b>CSO</b>	9	5	14	7	4	11	9	3	12
<b>Govt</b>	3	3	6	12	1	13	5	0	5
<b>Total</b>	12	8	20	19	5	24	14	3	17
<b>IFES</b>				8	2	10	7	1	8
<b>NDI</b>	6	5	11				1		
<b>NonAssisted</b>	6	3	9	11	3	14	6	2	8
<b>Total</b>	12	9	21	19	5	24	14	3	16

The questions were generalized to fit elected and appointed officials, civil servants and CSO members, and not every question was relevant to each respondent. Although this was not intended to be a scientifically based survey, asking everyone interviewed the same set of questions provided some interesting data for comparison purposes.

### Questions

The following set of questions were asked:

1. How often do you contact your district authorities/MP/ CSO/voters, and when was the last contact?
2. What was it about?
3. Were you satisfied with the outcome?
4. Has the work of the district authorities/MPs improved?
5. If yes, how?
6. Do district authorities/MPs represent citizen interests?
7. Why or why not?
8. Have you heard of any CSOs that work to improve policy? If so, which and what was the outcome?
9. Do you participate in local/national government decisions?
10. Why or why not, and if yes, how?
11. Can you name one policy changed by citizen input? What was it?

## Results

The results were interesting. There did not seem to be a significant difference in attitude or practice between assisted and non-assisted respondents. The one question that did show a difference between assisted and non-assisted respondents was whether they participated in national decision making. Here, more assisted respondents answered yes, than non-assisted. Local decision making showed little difference.

### Question No. 9a: Participate in Local Decision-Making?

Question No. 2a. 2 circles, date in Box, Decision Making.							
		Assisted		NonAssisted			Total
	M	F	T	M	F	T	
Yes	15	3	18	16	3	19	37
No	4	4	8	5	5	10	18

### Question No. 9b: Participate in National Decision-Making?

	Assisted			NonAssisted			Total
	M	F	T	M	F	T	
Yes	13	4	17	9	2	11	28
No	8	4	12	12	4	16	28

The common perception among respondents was that local government was more responsive, while Parliament was given lower marks. There was a slight difference on "no's" with more non-assisted respondents giving a negative answer..

### Question No. 6a: Do DA's Represent Citizen Interests?

	Assisted			NonAssisted			Total
	M	F	T	M	F	T	
Yes	17	5	22	15	5	20	42
No	3	3	6	7	2	9	15

**Question No. 6b: Do MP's Represent Citizen Interests?**

		Assisted			NonAssisted			Total
	M	F	T	M	F	T		
<b>Yes</b>	12	4	16	11	5	16		32
<b>No</b>	10	4	14	9	1	10		24

Most respondents did not understand the concept of public policy and the question had to be rephrased to "can you name one thing that has been changed by citizen input." Only a small portion of CSOs (mostly Accra-based) and a larger percentage of government officials, could name a policy. The most common one named was the VAT (Value Added Tax). There was no one CSO that stood out in the questionnaire, most respondents cited their own CSO or a local (geographically-speaking) CSO. Women's associations were also frequently named.

**Question No. 8: Can you name a CSO that has changed policy?**

				Assisted			NonAssisted			Total
			M	F	T	M	F	T		
FIDA			1	1	2					2
Cite own CSO			2	2	4	1	2	3		7
Tailors/dressmakers				1	1					1
Youth Coalition			1	2	3					3
Akplambamyo Youth			1		1					1
Amnschina			1		1					1
Bo;yan			1		1					1
Ewe Community			1		1					1
Farmers/Veg Growers			2		2					2
Fruit Sellers			1		1					1
Ghana HR Coalition			1		1					1
Hairdressers			2		2					2
Pion Women's			1		1					1
Traditional Healers			1		1					1
Union			1		1	1		1		2
Matantudu						1	1	2		2
Broadcasting Women							1	1		1
31 Dec Women						2		2		2
Bar Association						1		1		1
Beauticians						1		1		1
First Lady						1		1		1
Funeral Directors Association						1		1		1
Gab Katimali						1		1		1
IFES						1		1		1
NCEE						1		1		1
Women						1		1		1

There was little difference between assisted and non-assisted respondents in the answer to "Were you satisfied with the outcome" of your last contact (with either a national or local government official). There was also no difference based on location.

**Question 3: Were you satisfied with the outcome of the last meeting, by Assisted/Non-Assisted**

		Assisted			NonAssisted			Total
	M	F	T	M	F	T		
Yes	19	5	24	19	5	24		48
No	3	2	5	3	1	4		9

**Question 3: Were you satisfied with the outcome of the last meeting, by Location**

		Accra				South				North		
	M	F	T		M	F	T		M	F	T	
Yes	11	5	16		15	3	18		12	2	14	
No	1	1	2		3	2	5		2	0	2	

To the question "Has the work of the district authorities improved," there was no difference in responses between assisted or non-assisted for either district authorities or MPs.

**Question No. 4a: Has the Work of the District Authorities Improved?**

		Assisted			NonAssisted			Total
	M	F	T	M	F	T		
Yes	18	5	23	18	5	23		46
No	2	2	4	3	1	4		8

**Question No. 4b: Has the work of the MPs Improved?**

		Assisted			NonAssisted			Total
	M	F	T	M	F	T		
Yes	13	3	16	12	3	15		31
No	8	3	11	9	3	12		23

In the open-ended question "Why has DA/MP work improved?," most assisted respondents tended to cite CSO involvement, while non-assisted respondents tended to credit community or citizen involvement. Women's participation in government was mentioned occasionally in the answers, but more frequently by non-assisted respondents than assisted ones. This can be seen in the answers to the open-ended question: "Why/How has MP work improved?"

**Question No. 5a: Why has DA work improved?**

				Assisted			NonAssisted			Total
		M	F	T		M	F	T		
More citizen satisfaction							2	2		2
MP Assistance							1	1		1
More citizen involvement		1		1		7		7		8
More CSO interaction		3		3						3
Common fund		1	1	2		5	1	6		8
Better services/job		6		6		1		1		7
More pol competition		1		1		1		1		2
More receptive/aware		6	1	7		2	1	3		10
Listens does nothing			1	1		1		1		2
Better relations		1		1						1
Needs more transparency						1		1		1
Too busy						1		1		1

**Question 5b: Why has MP work improved?**

				Assisted			NonAssisted			Total
Why.....			M	F	T	M	F	T		
Passed specific legislation				1	1					1
More debates				1	1	2		2		3
More women participation						2	3	5		5
More citizen participation						1	1	2		2
More CSO interaction		2			2					2
More pol competition		1			1	1		1		2
More receptive/aware		2			2	2		2		4
Better citizen understanding		1			1					1
From NDI assistance		1			1					1
Too remote						1	1	2		
Too busy						1		1		1
Not from NDI assistance				1	1					1
On the job experience						2		2		2

The information on frequency of contact with DA's and MPs showed DA's were contacted much more frequently than MPs, and that non-assisted respondents contacted their DAs or MPs just as frequently as assisted respondents.

**Question No. 1a: How often do you contact your DA?**

		Assisted			NonAssisted			Total
	M	F	T	M	F	T		
<b>Often</b>	8	4	12	16	3	19		31
<b>Occasionally</b>	7	1	8	4	1	5		13
<b>Rarely</b>	1	2	3	1	3	4		7
<b>Never</b>					1	1		1

**Question No. 1b: How often do you contact your MP?**

		Assisted			NonAssisted			Total
	M	F	T	M	F	T		
<b>Often</b>	8		8	10	1	11		19
<b>Occasionally</b>	3		3	3	1	4		7
<b>Rarely</b>	4	1	5	2		2		7
<b>Never</b>	6	3	9	4	5	9		18

For additional or more detailed information please see the attached question response sheet.